

# भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० १२] नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, मार्च २३, १९६८/चैत्र ३, १८९०

No. 12] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, MARCH 23, 1968/CHAITRA 3, 1890

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके।

Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation.

नोटिस

NOTICE

नीचे लिखे भारत के असाधारण राजपत्र ११ मार्च, १९६८ तक प्रकाशित किये गये :—

The undermentioned Gazettes of India Extraordinary were published up to the 11th March, 1968.

Issue No.	No. and Date	Issued by	Subject
63	S.O. 808, dated 28th February, 1968	Ministry of Commerce.	Further amendment to the Exports (Control) Order, 1962.
64	S.O. 809, dated 28th February, 1968.	Ministry of Finance	The Finance Commission (Salaries and Allowances) Amendment Rules, 1968.
65	S.O. 810, dated 29th February, 1968.	Ministry of Commerce	Delegation of powers, in relation to all commodities other than food-stuffs and fertilizers, to the commissioner of Civil Supplies, Madras.
66	सं० ८११, दिनांक २९ फरवरी, १९६८.	वित्त मन्त्रालय	वित्त आयोग की स्थापना।
	S.O. 812, dated 29th February, 1968	Ministry of Finance	Constitution of a Finance Commission.
67	S.O. 813, dated 29th February, 1968.	Central Board of Direct Taxes.	The Income-tax (Amendment) Rules, 1962.

Issue No.	No. and Date	Issued by	Subject
68	S.O. 814, dated 2nd March, 1968.	Ministry of Finance	The Punjab Reorganisation (Removal of Difficulties) Order No. 5 of 1968.
69	S.O. 815, dated 4th March, 1968.	Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.	Approval of the film as specified therein.
70	S.O. 816, dated 4th March, 1968.	Ministry of Commerce.	Extending the period of management of the Pratap Spinning, Weaving and Manufacturing Company Limited., Amalner (Maharashtra) for a further period of one year from the 4th March, 1968.
71	S.O. 920, dated 5th March, 1968.	Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation.	Reserve Bank of India Award, 1968.
72	S.O. 921, dated 8th March, 1968.	Election Commission of India.	Appointment of dates for the election to the Council of States of Andhra Pradesh.
	S.O. 922, dated 8th March, 1968.	Do.	Designating the Secretary, Andhra Pradesh Legislature Department, Hyderabad to be the Returning Officer for the above biennial election to the Council of States (S.O. 921).
	S.O. 923, dated 8th March, 1968.	Do.	Appointment of the Assistant Secretary of Andhra Pradesh Legislature (Committees) Department, Hyderabad to assist the Returning Officer for the above biennial election to the Council of States (S.O. 921).
	S.O. 924, dated 8th March, 1968.	Do.	Fixation of hours for the above biennial election to the Council of States (S.O. 921).
73	S.O. 925, dated 8th March, 1968.	Ministry of Law.	Calling upon the elected members of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Andhra Pradesh to elect six members to fill the seats of members of the Council of States retiring on 2nd April, 1968.
74	S.O. 926, dated 8th March, 1968.	Do.	The Admission as Advocates (Training and Examination) Rules, 1968.
75	S.O. 927, dated 8th March, 1968.	Ministry of Commerce.	The Exports (Control) Order, 1968.
76	S.O. 928, dated 11th March, 1968.	Election Commission of India.	Calling upon the members of the electoral college of Delhi to elect a member to the Council of States and the appointment of dates for the biennial election.

Issue No.	No. and Date	Issued by	Subject
	S.O. 929, dated 11th March, 1968.	Election Commission of India.	Designating Shri R.K. Baweja Secretary, (Law and Judicial), Delhi Administration, Delhi to be the Returning Officer for the above biennial election to the Council of States, (S.O. 928).
	S.O. 930, dated 11th March, 1968.	Do.	Appointment of Shri D.S. Faugdar, Under Secretary (Medical), Delhi Administration Delhi, to assist the Returning Officer for the above biennial election to the Council of States, (S.O. 928).
	S.O. 931, dated 11th March, 1968.	Do.	Fixation of hours for the above biennial election to the Council of States, (S.O. 928).
77	S.O. 932, dated 11th March, 1968.	Do.	Calling upon the elected members of the Legislative Assembly of Jammu and Kashmir to elect a member to the Council of States and the appointment of dates for the biennial election.
	S.O. 933, dated 11th March, 1968.	Do.	Designating the Secretary, Jammu and Kashmir Legislative Assembly, Jammu to be the Returning Officer, for the above biennial election to the Council of States, (S.O. 932).
	S.O. 934, dated 11th March, 1968.	Do.	Appointment of the Deputy Secretary, Jammu and Kashmir Legislative Assembly, Jammu to assist the Returning Officer for the above biennial election to the Council of States, (S.O. 932).
	S.O. 935, dated 11th March, 1968.	Do.	Fixation of hours for the above biennial election to the Council of States (S.O. 932).
78	S.O. 936, dated 11th March, 1968.	Do.	Calling upon the elected members of the Legislative Assembly of each State or as the case may be, the members of the Electoral College of each Union Territory, mentioned in the table therein, to elect the member or members specified against that State or Union Territory, to the Council of States and appointment of dates for the biennial election.
	S.O. 937, dated 11th March, 1968.	Do.	Designating Returning Officer, and appointing Assistant Returning Officer respectively for each State mentioned in the table therein for the above biennial election to the Council of States, (S.O. 936).
	S.O. 938, dated 11th March, 1968.	Do.	Fixation of hours for the above biennial election to the Council of States, (S.O. 936).

Issue No.	No. and Date	Issued by	Subject
79	S.O. 939, dated 11th March, 1968.	Ministry of Law	Biennial elections to the Council of States—1968.
80	S.O. 940, dated 11th March, 1968.	Do.	Biennial elections to the Council of States—1968.
81	S.O. 998, dated 11th March, 1968.	Ministry of Commerce.	Authorising certain high Officers mentioned therein to make complaints in writing in Courts in respect of any offence punishable under Section 5 of the Imports and Exports (Control) Act, 1947 (18 of 1947).
82	S.O. 999, dated 11th March, 1968.	Do.	Constituting certain authorities for the purpose of hearing appeals specified therein.

ऊपर लिखे असाधारण राजपत्रों की प्रतियाँ प्रकाशन प्रबन्धक, सिविल लाइन्स, दिल्ली के नाम मांगपत्र भेजने पर भेज दी जाएंगी। मांगपत्र प्रबन्धक के पास इन राजपत्रों के जारी होने की तारीख से 10 दिन के भीतर पहुँच जाने चाहिए।

Copies of the Gazettes Extraordinary mentioned above will be supplied on indent to the Manager of Publications, Civil Lines, Delhi. Indents should be submitted so as to reach the Manager within ten days of the date of issue of these Gazettes.

### भाग II—खण्ड 3—उपखण्ड (ii)

#### PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ क्षेत्र प्रशासन को छोड़कर) केन्द्रीय प्राधिकरणों द्वारा जारी किए गए विधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं।

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) and by Central Authorities (other than the Administration of Union Territories).

#### ELECTION COMMISSION, INDIA

New Delhi, the 27th February 1968

S.O. 1007.—In pursuance of section 116C(2)(b) of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, the Election Commission hereby publishes the order pronounced on the 2nd February, 1968, by the Supreme Court of India, New Delhi, in Election Petition No. 10 of 1967.

#### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

#### CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

Civil Appeal No. 1693 of 1967

Smt. Sahodrabai Rai

Appellant

Versus

Ram Singh Aharwar

Respondent

#### JUDGMENT

HIDAYATULLAH, J.—This is an appeal against the judgment of the High Court of Madhya Pradesh at Jabalpur, dated September 21, 1967, dismissing the Election petition filed by the appellant on the preliminary ground that a proper copy

of the election petition was not served upon the answering parties. The facts of the case are as follows:

The appellant was a candidate for election to the Sagar Lok Sabha Scheduled Castes Constituency No. 24. The election took place on February 20, 1967. There were three other contesting candidates of whom the first respondent secured the largest number of votes and was declared elected. The appellant secured the second largest number of votes, her votes being less by just under 300 than the successful candidate's votes. An election petition was thereafter filed by the appellant on April 5, 1967. In this election petition the appellant challenged the election of the first respondent on four grounds. They were (a) wrongful acceptance of his nomination paper, (b) corrupt practice inasmuch as he appealed to religious through a pamphlet marked Annexure 'A', (c) undue influence, and (d) breaches of the Act and Rules. The pamphlet to which reference is made was styled Bhayankar Vajraghat and was published by Sarvadaliya Goraksha Mahabhiyan Samiti, Deori Kalan Branch. It charged the party of the appellant namely the Congress with encouraging cow-slaughter and offending the Hindu Sentiment. Details were given in it of the number of animals slaughtered every day in Madhya Pradesh and elsewhere and blamed the Congress with being a party to the practice. In the body of the election petition a translation in English of the Hindi pamphlet was incorporated. The original pamphlet was attached to the election petition and was marked Annexure "A". The election petitioner proceeded to say in her petition "it forms part of the petition".

When parties appeared the first respondent filed his written statement in great detail. He dealt with this pamphlet and answered the allegations of the election petitioner in relation thereto paragraph by paragraph. As a result of these pleas a number of issues were raised on July 18, 1967. No issue was raised in regard to the service of a defective copy of the election petition upon the respondent in general and the first respondent in particular. However, on August 3, 1967, a special objection was made by the first respondent claiming that the copy of the pamphlet had not been annexed to the copy of the election petition served upon him and therefore the election petition was liable to be dismissed in accordance with the provisions of Section 86 of the Representation of the People Act. A detailed reply to this objection was given by the election petitioner. She stated that this was an after-thought inasmuch as the translation of the pamphlet was incorporated in the election petition and the allegations regarding the pamphlet had been answered in detail by the answering respondent. The Court thereupon framed an additional issue on August 4, 1967. The issue ran as follows:

"Whether the election petition is liable to be dismissed for contravention of Section 81(3) of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 as copy of Annexure 'A' to the petition was not given along with the petition for being served on the respondents".

Parties first filed a number of affidavits pro and con. Later the Court ordered attendance of the deponents for cross-examination. In this way the appellant and her counsel who had filed a affidavits earlier were examined. Their case was that the copies of the election petition had been properly put together including in each copy an original pamphlet for service on the respondents. On the other side the first respondent and two others filed affidavits stating that when the copy of the election petition was received it was not accompanied by the pamphlet. In their examination in court all maintained the same position and were cross-examined. The learned Judge trying the case also ordered the attendance of the Reader of the Deputy Registrar of the High Court who had dealt with the election petition and he was examined as Court witness No. 1. He stated that the copies of the petition were complete except that the pamphlet was not annexed to each copy. He stated that he had noted at the time this fact but had treated the pamphlet as a document and not as an Annexure to the election petition.

The learned Judge, on an appraisal of this material held that the copies of the election petition served upon the respondents were not accompanied by the pamphlet which was an Annexure to the election Petition. After examining the law on the subject the learned Judge came to the conclusion that the election petition should be dismissed under Section 86 of the Representation of the People Act and he accordingly dismissed it with costs. No other issue which was struck between the parties was gone into because the election petition failed at the very threshold.

In this appeal it is contended that the learned Judge was in error in thinking that the pamphlet ought to have accompanied the copies of the election petition

or that the law required that it should have been annexed to the copy of the election petition served on the respondents. In this connection our attention was drawn to the provisions of the Representation of the People Act to which we shall refer presently. On the other side it was contended that whatever the meaning of the expressions "the election petition", "annexures" or "schedules" in the Act, the election petitioner by her own conduct had made this document a part of the election petition and therefore it was incumbent upon her to have served the whole of the election petition and not only a part of it as she did and therefore the order now appealed against was correct. Before we come to these rival contentions we find it necessary to refer first to the relevant provisions on the subject.

S. 81 of the Representation of the People Act occurs in Chapter II which is headed "Presentation of Election Petitions to Election Commission". It provides as follows:

*"Presentation of Petitions:*

- (1) An election petition calling in question any election may be presented on one or more of the grounds specified in sub-section (1) of section 100 and section 101 to the High Court by any candidate at such election or any elector within forty-five days from, but not earlier than, the date of election of the returned candidate, or if there are more than one returned candidate at the election and the dates of their election are different, the later of those two dates.

*Explanation:*—In this sub-section, elector means a person who was entitled to vote at the election to which the election petition relates, whether he has voted at such election or not.

- (3) Every election petition shall be accompanied by as many copies thereof as there are respondents mentioned in the petition and every such copy shall be attested by the petitioner under his own signature to be a true copy of the petition".

The first respondent draws pointed attention to the third—sub-section which says that every election petition shall be accompanied by as many copies thereof as there are respondents mentioned in the petition and every such copy shall be attested by the petitioner under his own signature to be a true copy of the petition. The dispute therefore is whether the pamphlets could be described in this case as a part of the election petition. The answering respondent says that it is so and was considered to be so by the election petitioner herself when she stated that it was to be read as a part of the election petition.

The matter, in our opinion, is not to be resolved on how the election petitioner viewed the matter but from the point of view of the requirement of the law on the subject. For this purpose we have to turn to Section 83 of the Representation of the People Act which provides what the contents of the election petition shall be. It reads as follows:—

- (1) An election petition—

- (a) shall contain a concise statement of the material facts on which the petitioner relies;
- (b) shall set forth full particulars of any corrupt practice that the petitioner alleges, including as full a statement as possible of the names of the parties alleged to have committed such corrupt practice and the date and place of the commission of each such practice; and
- (c) shall be signed by the petitioner and verified in the manner laid down in the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (5 of 1908), for the verification of pleadings.

Provided that where the petitioner alleges any corrupt practice, the petition shall also be accompanied by an affidavit in the prescribed form in support of the allegation of such corrupt practice and the particulars thereof.

- (2) Any schedule or annexure to the petition shall also be signed by the petitioner and verified in the same manner as the petition.

The answering respondent herein again draws pointed attention to the fact that the schedules and the annexures to the petition are mentioned and they have to

be signed and verified in the same manner as the petition meaning thereby that as the election petitioner had made the pamphlet a part of the election petition she was required to sign and verify the pamphlet and also to serve a copy of it as required by sub-section (3) of section 81 when the election petition was served. He then relies upon section 86 which provides that the High Court shall dismiss an election petition which does not comply with the provisions of section 81, section 82 or section 117.

An argument was raised in this case as to whether section 86(1) is mandatory or merely directory we need not go into this aspect of the case. In our opinion, the present matter can be resolved on an examination of the relevant facts and the contents of the election petition as detailed in section 83 reproduced above. It may be pointed out here that the trial of election petition has to follow as far as may be the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure. We are therefore of opinion that it is permissible to look into the Code of Civil Procedure to see what exactly would have been the case if this was a suit and not a trial of an election petition.

Under the Code of Civil Procedure a suit is commenced by a plaint. This is provided by O. IV, r. 1 which says that every suit shall be instituted by presenting a plaint to the Court. After the plaint is received O. V. provides the summoning of the defendants in the case and r. 2 of that order says that every summons shall be accompanied by a copy of the plaint, and if so permitted, by a concise statement. We then turn to the provisions of O. VII which deals with the contents of a plaint. The first rule mentions the particulars which must be in a plaint. It is not necessary to refer to them. The plaint has to be signed and verified. R. 9 then provides that the plaintiff shall endorse on the plaint and annex thereto a list of documents, if any, which he has produced along with it and, if the plaint is admitted, shall present as many copies on plain paper of the plaint as there are defendants unless the Court by reason of the length of the plaint or the number of defendants, or for any other sufficient reason, permits him to present a like number of concise statements of the nature of the claims made etc. It will be noticed here that what is required to be provided are copies of the plaint itself or the concise statement according to the number of defendants. There is no mention here of any other documents of which a copy is needed to be presented to the Court for service to the defendants. Then we come to r. 14 which states that where a plaintiff sues upon a document in his possession or power he shall produce it in court when the plaint is presented and shall at the same time deliver the document or a copy thereof to be filed with the plaint. It will be noticed that he is required to file one copy of the document and not as many copies as there are defendants in the case. It would therefore follow that a copy of the document is not expected to be delivered with the copy of the plaint to the answering defendants when summons is served on them. In the schedules to the Code of Civil Procedure we have got appendix B which prescribes the forms for summons to the defendants. There is only one form of summons in appendix B, (Form No. 4) in which the copy of the negotiable instrument is to accompany the copy of the plaint. That is so, because of the special law applying to the negotiable instruments and the time limit within which pleas to that document have to be raised and this is only in summary suits. No other form makes any mention of any document accompanying the summons with the copy of the plaint. We need not go into more details. It is clear that the documents which are filed with the plaint have to be accompanied by one copy of those documents. This is because the copy is compared with the original and the copy is endorsed by the clerk of court and the document is sometimes returned to the party to be produced into Court later. The copy takes the place of the document concerned and is not to be sent out to the parties with the plaint.

We may now whether the election law provides anything different. The only provision to which our attention has been drawn is sub-section (3) of section 81 and sub-section (2) of section 83. The first provides that every election petition shall be accompanied by as many copies thereof as there are respondents mentioned in the petition and that every such copy shall be an authenticated true copy. The words used here are only "the election petition". There is no mention of any document accompanying the election petition. If the matter stood with only this sub-section there would be no doubt that what was intended to be served is only a copy of the election petition proper. Assistance is however taken from the provisions of sub-section (2) of section 83 which provides that any schedule or any annexure to the petition shall also be signed by the petitioner and verified in the same manner as the petition. It is contended that since the pamphlet was an annexure to the petition it was not only necessary to sign and verify it, but that it should have been treated as a part of the election petition itself and a copy

served upon the respondents. In this way, non-compliance with the provisions of section 86(1) is made out. In our opinion, this is too strict a reading of the provisions. We have already pointed out that section 81(3) speaks only of the election petition. Pausing here, we would say that since the election itself reproduced the whole of the pamphlet in a translation in English, it could be said that the averments with regard to the pamphlet were themselves a part of the petition and therefore the pamphlet was served upon the respondents although in a translation and not in original. Even if this be not the case we are quite clear that sub-section (2) of section 83 has reference not to a document which is produced as evidence of the averments of the election petition but to averments of the election petition which are put in not in the election petition but in the accompanying schedules or annexures. We can give quite a number of examples from which it would be apparent that many of the averments of the election petition are capable of being put as schedules or annexures. For example the details of the corrupt practice therein the former days used to be set out separately in the schedules and which may in some cases be so done even after the amendment of the present law. Similarly, details of the averments too compendious for being included in the election petition may be set out in the schedules or annexures to the election petition. The law then requires that even though they are outside the election petition, they must be signed and verified, but such annexures or schedules are then treated as integrated with the election petition and copies of them must be served on the respondents if the requirement regarding service of the election petition is to be wholly complied with. But what we have said here does not apply to documents which are merely evidence in the case but which for reasons of clarity and to lend force to the petition are not kept back but produced or filed with the election petitions. They are in no sense an integral part of the averments of the petition but are only evidence of those averments and in proof thereof. The pamphlet therefore must be treated as a document and not as a part of the election petition in so far as averments are concerned. When the election petitioner said that it was to be treated as part of her election petition she was merely indicating that it was not to be thought that she had not produced the document in time. She was insisting upon the document remaining with the petition so that it could be available whenever the question of the election petition or its contents arose. It would be stretching the words of sub-section (2) of section 83 too far to think that every document produced as evidence in the election petition becomes a part of the election petition proper. In this particular case we do not think that the pamphlet could be so treated. We are, therefore, of the opinion that whether or not section 86(1) is mandatory or directory there was no breach of the provisions of the Representation of the People Act in regard to the filing of the election petition or the service of the copies thereof and the order under appeal was therefore erroneous.

We accordingly set aside the order and remand the case for trial from this stage. The costs of the appellant will be costs in the cause. The respondent will bear his own costs.

(Sd.) M. HIDAYATULLAH, J.

(Sd.) R. S. BACHAWAT, J.

(Sd.) K. S. HEGDE, J.

New Delhi,  
February 2, 1968.

## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

### CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

*Civil Appeal No. 1693 (NCE) of 1967*

Appeal under Section 116A of the People Representation Act 1951 from the Judgment and order dated the 21st September 1967 of the Madhya Pradesh High Court at Jabalpur in Election Petition No. 10 of 1967.

**Shrimati Sahodrabai Rai**

aged about 48 years,

Widow of Shri Murlidhar Rai,

Agriculturist, resident of

village Karrapur, Tehsil and District, Sagar, M. P.

**Appellant.**

*Versus*

1. Shri Ram Singh Aharwar, aged about 27 years son of Shri Ganpat Lal Aharwar, resident of Purblyau Tori, Sagar, Tehsil and Distt. Sagar (M. P.).



2. Shri Churaman, aged about 50 years son of Shri Ramle, resident of Silar P. O. Decri, Tehsil Rehli, Distt. Sagar (M. P.).
3. Shri Sunder Lal, aged about 30 years, son of Bakkal resident of Mohal No. 14, Sadar Bazar, Sagar Tehsil and District Sagar (M.P.).

Respondents.

CORAM

2nd February, 1968

Hon'ble Mr. Justice M. Hidayatullah.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice R. S. BACHAWAT.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice K. S. HEGDE.

For the Appellant.—M/s G. N. Dikshit and R. N. Dikshit, Advocates.

For the Respondent No. 1.—Mr C. B. Agarwala, Senior Advocate,

(Miss Uma Mehta, Mr. S. K. Bagga, and

Mrs. Sureshta Bagga, Advs. with him.)

THE APPEAL above mentioned being called on for hearing before this Court on the 1st and 2nd days of February 1968 UPON hearing Mr. G. N. Dikshit Counsel for the Appellant and Mr. C. B. Agarwala Counsel for Respondent No. 1 THIS COURT IN ALLOWING THE APPEAL DOTH ORDER (1) THAT the judgment and order dated the 21st September 1967 of the Madhya Pradesh High Court at Jabalpur in Election Petition No. 10 of 1967 upholding the preliminary objection that the Election Petition is liable to be dismissed for contravention of Section 81(3) of the Representation of People Act 1951 be and is hereby set aside and the case be and is hereby remanded to Madhya Pradesh High Court with the direction that the said High Court Do restore to its file the Election Petition No. 10 of 1967 and Do try the same on merits from this stage and dispose of the same in the light of the directions contained in the judgment herein (2) THAT the costs of the appellant incurred in this Court shall be the costs in Election Petition No. 10 of 1967 and the Respondent herein shall bear his own costs AND THIS COURT DOTH FURTHER ORDER THAT this ORDER be punctually observed and carried into execution by all concerned.

WITNESS the Hon'ble Mr. Kailash Nath Wanchoo Chief Justice of India at the Supreme Court, New Delhi this the 2nd day of February, 1968.

(Sd.) M. P. SAXENA,

Deputy Registrar.

[No. 82/MP/10/67.]

By Order,

A. N. SEN, Secy.

---

New Delhi, the 7th March 1968

**S.O. 1008.**—In pursuance of section 106 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, the Election Commission hereby publishes the Order, pronounced on the 9th November, 1967 and 13th November, 1967 by the High Court of Gujarat at Ahmedabad in Election Petition No. 23 of 1967.

## ELECTION PETITION NO. 23 OF 1967

9th November, 1967

The Hon'ble Mr Justice B. J. Divan

No. 1: Yes.

Nos. 2 to 5: No.

Mr. K. G. Vakharia with Mr. H. M. Mehta for the petitioner.

Mr. S. M. Shah for respondent No. 1.

Respondent No. 2 served.

CORAM: DIVAN J.

(9-11-1967)

## ORAL JUDGMENT —

This Election Petition has been filed by the petitioner challenging the election of the first respondent to Lok Sabha from Parliamentary constituency No. 10, viz., Gandhinagar parliamentary constituency in Gujarat State. The petitioner was one of the candidates contesting the election and the two respondents and one Natvarlal Bhagwandas Parmar also stood as candidates but the said Natvarlal withdrew from the contest and the petitioner and respondents Nos. 1 and 2 ultimately contested the election. The poll was taken in this constituency on February 21, 1967, and the result of the election was declared on February 24, 1967. After the votes were counted it was found that the petitioner had obtained 1,26,208 votes, respondent No. 1 had obtained 1,56,148 votes, respondent No. 2 had obtained 50,702 votes; and 21,600 votes were rejected as invalid votes. The first respondent was declared elected as a Member of Parliament from Parliamentary constituency No. 10, he having secured the largest number of votes. The parliamentary constituency No. 10, Gandhinagar Parliamentary constituency, is reserved for Scheduled Castes; and the petitioner and the two respondents are all members of the Scheduled Castes. This petition has been filed by the petitioner for a declaration that the election of respondent No. 1 from this constituency is void; and for a further declaration that the petitioner should be declared elected from this constituency. The petitioner has also prayed for the costs of the petition and further other reliefs.

The main grounds, apart from the contentions on technical points, that have been urged in support of this Election Petition are that there was improper reception, refusal and rejection of votes and also reception of votes which were void. It is also alleged in the petition that respondent No. 1, his agents and other persons with the consent of the first respondent have committed the corrupt practice of bribery inasmuch as they had given a gift and a gratification to respondent No. 2 for standing at the election and to contest the election from this constituency. It is also alleged that respondent No. 1 had incurred and/or authorized expenditure in contravention of s. 77 read with rules 86 and 90 of the Conduct of Election Rules, 1961 (hereinafter referred to as the Rules), and thereby committed a corrupt practice. The petitioner also contends in the petition that respondent No. 1, his agents and other persons with the consent of respondent No. 1 committed the corrupt practice of obtaining or procuring or attempting to obtain or procure assistance of a Government servant mentioned in s. 123(7) of the representation of the People Act, 1951. (hereinafter referred to as the Act); and that such assistance was for the furtherance of the prospects of respondent No. 1's election. The next ground which is relied upon in the petition is that respondent No. 1 or his agents or other persons with the consent of respondent No. 1 had published false statements, which they believed to be false and did not believe to be true, regarding the personal character and conduct and candidature of the petitioner, which were reasonably calculated to prejudice the prospects of the petitioner's election. It was also been contended that respondent No. 2 had made false statement regarding the candidature of the petitioner inasmuch as respondent No. 2 was propagating that he was the real candidate of the Republican Party of India and not the petitioner; and it is the contention of the petitioner that this propaganda was carried on at the instance of respondent No. 1 and with the consent of respondent No. 1. The petitioner further relies on the ground that respondent No. 1 and his agents with the consent of respondent No. 1 committed the corrupt practice of appealing to the voters to vote for the first respondent and not to vote for the petitioner on the ground of caste and community of the petitioner and that such appeal was made for the furtherance of the prospects of the election of respondent No. 1 and for prejudicially affecting the petitioner's election. These contentions as regards the different corrupt practices and grounds for setting aside the election were challenged by respondent No. 1 in his written statement and the facts averred in the petition are denied. It has been further contended by the first respondent in his written statement that the petition was barred by limitation; and secondly, that the petitioner was not entitled to scrutiny and recounting of the votes on the basis of the averments made in the petition.

As regards the two technical pleas regarding the bar of limitation and regarding the scrutiny and recounting of votes on the basis of the averments made in the petition, two preliminary issues were raised by my learned brother Shelat J. and by my judgment and order, dated August 29, 1967, I decided both the issues

against respondent No. 1. Thereafter issues on the merits of the averment set out in the petition were settled and the trial has gone on now before me as regards these issues on the merits. At the time when the trial began before me on the merits of the case, Mr. Mehta for the petitioner, stated that the petitioner did not wish to press issues Nos. 1, 2, 4, and 8. Issue No. 1 is in connection with improper reception, refusal and rejection of votes and reception of votes which were void. Issue No. 2 is a consequential issue as to whether the result of the election in so far as it concerned the first respondent has been materially affected by such improper reception, refusal and rejection of votes and reception of votes which were void. Issue No. 4 is regarding incurring of expenditure and that issue has not been pressed, as stated by Mr. Mehta. Issue No. 8 is regarding the appeal by respondent No. 1 and his agents with the consent of respondent No. 1, to voters for votes on the ground of cast and community. Since Issues Nos. 1 and 2 regarding improper reception, refusal or rejection of the votes and reception of votes which were void, have not been pressed, Issue No. 10, as to whether the petitioner is entitled to a declaration that he is a duly elected member of Parliament from Gandhinagar parliamentary constituency at the last general elections, would not survive. Mr. Mehta at the commencement of the trial also stated that he did not wish to press the issue as to the corrupt practice regarding the bribery of respondent No. 2 to induce him to withdraw from the election. Therefore, the real contest before me is as regards Issues Nos 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9.

As regards Issue No. 5, which relates to the assistance of any gazetted officers, members of the Armed Forces etc., Mr. Mehta stated at the commencement of the hearing before me that the petitioner would rely only on the instance of Jethalal B. Jadav, alleged to be an employee of the Income-tax Department and not on any other instance of assistance said to have been received by the first respondent from other Government servants, though several such instances are alleged in the petition.

The evidence which has been led before me at the hearing of this petition has been led in connection with mainly these issues. Firstly, whether the first respondent and his agents with his consent published false statements regarding the personal character conduct and candidature of the petitioner, and in that connection s. 123(4) of the Act is relied upon. So far as Issue No. 5 is concerned evidence has been led in order to establish that Jethalal B. Jadav, an employee of the Income Tax Department, had worked for the first respondent and that the first respondent had procured or obtained the assistance of Jethalal B. Jadav for the furtherance of the prospects of election respondent No. 1 at that election. As regards Issue No. 7, the petitioner did try to lead evidence about respondent No. 2, holding himself out as the real candidate of the Republican Party of India and representing that the petitioner was not the real candidate of that party but at the time of arguments before me, that issue was not seriously pressed before me, though that issue has not in terms been given up.

I will first deal with Issue No. 7 as that issue can be very easily disposed of. Issue No. 7 is in these terms:—

"Whether the petitioner proves that at the instance or with the consent of respondent No. 1, respondent No. 2 held himself out as the real candidate of the Republican Party of the India and that the petitioner was not the real candidate of that Party."

Now, it appears that late Dr. Ambedkar has started this party known as the Republican Party of India and later on one section of that party seceded from the main body and what is known as the Republican Party of India (Nagpur), came to be formed by that section. The original body and the new seceding section both claimed to be the genuine or the real Republican Party of India. The petitioner was a candidate put up by the Republican Party of India, the parent body; whereas the second respondent was the candidate put up by the Republican Party of India (Nagpur). The evidence of Yashwantrao Tukaram Indulkar, witness No. 7 for the petitioner, establishes these facts and it is clear that each of the two sections was seriously contending that it was the real Republican Party of India. Under these circumstances, it cannot be said that there was any false representation by respondent No. 2 or his supporters when they contended that respondent No. 2 was the real candidate of the Republican Party of India and carried on propaganda to the effect that the petitioner was not the real candidate of the Republican Party of India. Under these circumstances,

though the Republican Party of India was formed for the political uplift of backward classes and scheduled castes and though this particular Parliamentary constituency of Gandhinagar has a reserved seat for scheduled castes candidate, it cannot be said that there was any corrupt practice when respondent No. 2 put forward the plea that he himself was the real candidate of the Republican Party of India. Under these circumstances even though respondent No. 2 might have contended to that effect, it cannot be said that he did so with the consent of respondent No. 1 or at the instance of respondent No. 1, and in any event, that type of propaganda carried on by respondent No. 2 cannot be said to amount to any corrupt practice. It is quite possible that respondent No. 2 genuinely believed that the section of which he was the representative *viz.*, the Republican Party of India (Nagpur), was the genuine Republican Party of India and under that *bona fide* belief he might have carried on that propaganda and under these circumstances that particular ground cannot help the petitioner at all.

Turning now to Issue No. 6, this issue deals with the question of publication of false statements regarding the personal character, conduct and candidature of the petitioner. Such publication is alleged to have been done by respondent No. 1 or the agents of respondent No. 1 with the consent of respondent No. 1. It is contended by the petitioner that the false statements were thus published not believing them to be true and believing them to be false; and this was done with reasonable calculation to prejudice the election of the petitioner.

One Jayantibhai Ambaram Subodh, petitioner's witness No. 12, is the editor, printer and publisher of a fortnightly journal called: "Tamanna". This journal is published from Ahmedabad and it mostly deals with the problems of scheduled caste and backward classes. Jayantibhai Subodh is also a political and social worker and is connected with several bodies working for the uplift of backward classes and scheduled castes. The main grievance which has been made is regarding the publication of same items in the issue of "Tamanna", dated February 10, 1967, and it is urged that what was set out in that issue of "Tamanna" was false and false to the knowledge of the publisher and further that the first respondent himself had distributed copies of this issue of "Tamanna" amongst the electors in this constituency with a view to turn the voters against the petitioner. Exhibit "E" contains marked portions from this issue of February 10, 1967. At page 2 in a passage in an appeal to the electors to vote for the Congress it has been stated:—

"There are only a few persons in the party of Shri Karsandas (the petitioner). These few persons are at present engaged in picking up the pieces of silver discarded or thrown by Bhalkaka and Vadibhai Seth of the Swatantra party and they are engrossed in making these collections of dirty pieces of silver. Does not this look like a scene where used pieces of leaf-plates are snatched away after a big cast dinner?"

The next portion which has been objected to is also on page 2 of this issue and is in these terms:—

"It is learnt that Shri Karsandas Parmar (the petitioner) has also tried to arrive at a bargain with Shri Indulal and as a part of that bargain Shri Ramesh Parmar was offered a few pieces of silver to induce Ramesh Parmar to withdraw his candidature. Still Ramesh Parmar found that amount inadequate and at present Ramesh Parmar has persisted in his attitude and has stood as a candidate against Karsandas Parmar and is growling at him."

It may be mentioned here that Gandhinagar Parliamentary constituency included the area of Kankaria Legislative Assembly seat and Rameshchandra Parmar was the candidate for Kankaria Legislative Assembly seat. The said article further sets out as follows:—

"Shri Karsandas Parmar for the sake of security of his seat has mortgaged his Republican party with said Shri Vadibhai Mehta of Swatantra Party and secret agreements have already been arrived at to mortgage his party with Shri Indulal."

At page 6 of this issue of "Tamanna", it has been stated:—

"It is learnt that Shri Karsandas Parmar, the Republican Party candidate, who is contesting the Harijan Seat Party candidate, who is contesting the Harijan Seat from Gandhinagar Lok Sabha constituency, with the help of the Swatantra Party, is going round the villages and

is making vain attempts to secure votes by offering packets of sweet-meats to Harijan voters. Harijans, who know the art of converting the elephant of the emperor into a mouse, accept these packets of sweet-meat offered by Shri Karsandas Parmar and at the same time they tell him: "Sir, Please do not worry", and such cryptic answers are given to Karsandas Parmar. Will the uplift of the Harijan Society be brought about by the sweet-meats prepared from the vegetable ghee of the swatantra party or by the dry but substantial bread of the Congress Party? Harijans understand the real matter involved in this controversy and just as in the past they had consumed the elephant of the emperor but returned, a mouse, in the same manner the elephant of Karsandas will be converted skillfully into a mouse; and from his ballot boxes instead of votes only mice will come out and that seems to be the opinion all around.

Experienced Harijan leaders are uttering a warning that Harijans should beware of these pieces of Sweet-meats. Hence Harijans of Viramgan, Sanand and Dehgam Talukas have publicly announced their decision to cast their votes for the Congress candidate Somchandibhai Manubhai Solanki and Congress candidates for the State Legislative Assembly.

A question is being asked whether sweet-meat packets will be given at the time of the voting?"

It is contended on behalf of the petitioner that these different passages, two occurring at page 2 and the third occurring at page 6, all contain false statements of facts against the petitioner and these statements were deliberately made with a view to further the election prospects of the first respondent. In this connection, it is further alleged on behalf of the petitioner that the first respondent himself published these false statements by distributing the copies of this particular issue of "Tamanna" to various voters in the constituency.

Petitioner's witness No. 12, Jayantibhai Subodh has proved the contents of Ex. "E", since he is the editor, printer and publisher of this journal and he has stated that the issue in which Ex. "E" appears was a copy of his newspaper and the issue was duly published by his newspaper. In his cross-examination with the leave of the Court by the learned counsel for the petitioner, Jayantibhai Subodh stated that the views which were generally expressed in "Tamanna" were in favour of the Congress and for the last about 25 years, except for the duration of the Mahagujarat movement, Jayantibhai had been a supporter of the Congress Party. He admitted in his cross-examination by the learned counsel for the petitioner that he had worked for the first respondent in the course of his election campaign but he also stated that he had done so far several other candidates of the Congress Party. He stated that the contents for Ex. "E" from which I have set out the passages above, were printed at the time when the election campaign was going on and Jayantibhai desired that the first respondent should succeed against the petitioner and hence he had written those portions. The materials which Jayantibhai has set out as facts in Ex. "E", were gathered partly from other newspapers, partly from what Jayantibhai came to know through correspondence and partly through other sources. By other sources Jayantibhai meant what he sometimes over-heard, from conversations and sometimes information and facts which were passed on to him by social workers. The following passages occur in the cross-examination of Jayantibhai:—

"Because of the short time left before going to the press, very often we print facts in our articles without any verification from other sources but we rely on our own judgement to ascertain whether the facts are true or not. I do not agree that what has been included in Ex. "E" is all false. I have not yet tried to find out whether what has been stated as a fact in Ex. "E" is true or not because there was no need for me to do so so far."

Jayantibhai admits having accompanied the first respondent in his election campaign and the first respondent, who has also stopped into the witness box, has confirmed this aspect of the assistance which Jayantibhai Subodh was giving to him in his election campaign. Apart from being the editor, printer and publisher of "Tamanna", Jayantibhai was connected with a body called, "Ahmedabad City Backward Classes Voters's Council", and was the Chief Convenor of that Council. The said Council was canvassing for the Congress candidates and had published a booklet, Ex. "G" for the purpose of carrying on propaganda on behalf of several Congress candidates and the first respondent was the candidate backed by the Congress Party in this constituency.

The tests which had been laid down by the Supreme Court regarding S. 123(4) of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 are to be found in several decisions of the Supreme Court. In *Inder Lal v. Lal Singh*, A.I.R. 1962 S. C.1159, the Supreme Court has laid down as follows:—

"In prescribing the requirement that the false statement should have relation to the personal character of the candidate under S. 123(4), a distinction is intended to be drawn between the personal character of the candidate and his public or political character. The provisions postulates that if a false statement is made in regard to the public or political character of the candidate, it would not constitute a corrupt practice even if it is likely to prejudice the prospects of that candidate's election.

But circulation of false statements about the private or personal character of the candidate during the period preceding elections is likely to work against the freedom of election itself inasmuch as the effect created by false statements cannot be met by denials in proper time and so the constituency has to be protected against the circulation of such false statements which are likely to affect the voting of the electors. Dissemination of false statements about the personal character of a candidate thus constitutes a corrupt practice.

The allegations made in a pamphlet issued by the successful candidate that the other candidate was a purchaser of the opponents of the Congress by means of money clearly attracted the provisions of S. 123(4). In plain terms, the statement amounted to an allegation that the other candidate bought by offering bribes the votes of the opponents of the Congress. Bribery is itself a corrupt practice and if it is said against a candidate that he practises the corrupt practice of buying the votes of the opponent of the Congress by means of Bribery that clearly and unequivocally affects his private character. As the statement alleged that the bribes were offered by the other candidate for the purpose of election, in that sense it might be that it was his public character which was falsely criticised. But, it would be idle to contend that it was a false statement only against the public character of the other candidate. Publication of the impugned pamphlet constituted a corrupt practice under S. 123(4). The result of this conclusion inevitably was that the election of the successful candidate must be declared to be invalid because the corrupt practice fell under S. 101(b) and was outside the purview of S. 100(2).

In *Sheopal Singh v. Ram Pratap*, A.I.R., 1965 S.C. 677, the Supreme Court again examined the provisions of S. 123(4) and observed:—

"Section 123(4) prohibits any statement of fact in relation to personal character of conduct of any candidate, which is not only false but also the candidate making it either believes it to be false or does not believe it to be true. It implies that a statement of fact relating to the personal character or conduct etc. of a candidate can be made, if it is true. Even if it is false, the candidate making it is protected, unless he makes it believing it to be false or not believing it to be true, that is to say statements which are not true made *bona fide* are also outside the ambit of the provision. To be within the mischief of sub-s. (4) of S. 123 of the Act such a statement shall satisfy another test, namely, it shall be a statement reasonably calculated to prejudice the prospects of the election of the candidate against whom it is made. The burden of proof as a matter of law and as a matter of adducing evidence is on the party who seeks to get the election set aside to establish corrupt practice; but if he adduces sufficient evidence, the burden of adducing evidence shifts on to the other party."

The Supreme Court has further observed:—

"Any statement made, which reflects on the mental or moral character of a person is a reflection on his personal character, whereas any criticism of a person's political or public activities and policies is outside it. The fact that such a statement is made in the course of a political or public activity does not make it any of less a statement in relation to his personal character or conduct. It is a question of fact in each case under what category a particular statement falls. To make a statement that a minister has misappropriated the cement in his charge and built a theatre from out of the proceeds is certainly a reflection on his personal character and conduct."

It has also been observed by the Supreme Court:

"Under S. 123(4) of the Act *mens rea* is a necessary ingredient of the corrupt practice and the person who publishes a statement whether he is the

another of it or not, does not commit a corrupt practice, unless he has the requisite knowledge. The sub-section does not accept the doctrine of constructive knowledge."

It should be borne in mind that the observation regarding *mens rea* being a part of S. 123(4) of the Act was made by the Supreme Court while dealing with the argument before it that a particular person who was not joined as a party had committed this corrupt practice under S. 123(4); and the Supreme Court pointed out that there was no allegation of a corrupt practice against that particular individual.

In *Dr. Jagjit Singh v. Kartar Singh*, A.I.R. 1966 S.C. 773, the Supreme Court has pointed out that the onus to prove the essential ingredients prescribed by Sub-s. (4) of S. 123 is on him who alleges publication of false statements made by the candidate. He has to show that the impugned statement has been published by the candidate or his agent or by any other person with the consent of the candidate or his election agent. He has further to show that the impugned statement is a statement of fact which is false; that the candidate either believed that the said statement was false, or did not believe it to be true; and that the statement is the relation to the personal character or conduct of the complainant candidate or his candidature.

The last judgement of the Supreme Court which requires to be mentioned in this connection is in *Kumara Nand v. Brijmohan Lal Sharma*, A.I.R. 1967 S.C. 808; in this judgement the Supreme Court has pointed out that the main onus on an election petitioner under S. 123(4) is to show that a statement of fact was published by a candidate or his agent or by any other person with the consent of the candidate or his election agent and also to show that that statement was false and related to his personal character or conduct. Once that is proved and the complaining candidate has sworn as above indicated, the burden shifts to the candidate making the false statement of fact to show what his belief was. The further question as to prejudice to the prospects of election is generally a matter of inference to be arrived at by the tribunal on the facts and circumstances of each case. At page 812 of the report, Wancho J. (as he then was) delivering the judgement of the Supreme Court has observed as follows:—

"The sub-section requires: (i) publication of any statement of fact by a candidate (ii) that fact is false (iii) the candidate believes it to be false or does not believe it to be true, (iv) the statement is in relation to the personal character or conduct of another candidate; and (v) the said statement is one being reasonably calculated to prejudice the prospects of the other candidate's election.....If the candidate either believes the statement to be false or does not believe it to be true he would be responsible under S. 123(4)."

It is in the light of these four decisions of the Supreme Court that I have to consider whether the petitioner has succeeded in establishing the publication of false statements directed against the petitioner. The petitioner has stepped into the witness-box and has stated that the statements and allegations concerning him and appearing in the issue of "Tamanna", dated February 10, 1967, are all false and got up. He has further stated that "Tamanna" is the only journal of the backward and scheduled castes in Gujarat which is published regularly and it has a wide circulation amongst the scheduled castes in Gujarat and it also publishes Government advertisements. In the portion which has been set out at page 2, it has been alleged against the petitioner that he had committed a corrupt practice of trying to induce Ramesh Parmar to withdraw his candidature by offering a few pieces of silver to Ramesh Parmar but Ramesh Parmar found that amount inadequate and persisted in standing as a candidate. Under S. 123(1)(A), it amounts to the corrupt practice of bribery to give any gift or offer any promise to any person to withdraw his candidature; and it is clear that in this passage regarding Ramesh Parmar the corrupt practice of bribery as defined in S. 123(1)(A) has been attributed to the petitioner. In the other passage at page 2, it has been alleged that the few persons who are in the party of the petitioner are picking up the discarded pieces of silver thrown by Bhaikaks and Vedibhai Sheth of the Swatantra Party. It has also been alleged at page 2 that in order to secure his own seat, the so called Republican Party of the petitioner has mortgaged with said Shri Vadibhai Mehta of Swatantra Party and also with Indulal (of Janta Parishad). It is possible to argue that so far as these political alliances are concerned, they have been described in a very crude and exaggerated language. To that extent the allegations against the petitioner cannot be said to be against his personal character as distinguished from his political or public character. But to attribute

the corrupt practice of offering money to a candidate to withdraw candidature would certainly be an attack against the personal character of an individual as pointed by the Supreme Court in *Inder Lal's* case (supra).

At page 6 of the issue of "Tamanna", dated February 10, 1967 it has also been alleged that the petitioner was making vain efforts for securing votes by offering packets of sweet-meats to voters while visiting different villages; and the warning allegedly uttered by experienced Harijan leaders against these sweet-meats has also been set out at page 6. Under S. 123(1) (A) a corrupt practice of bribery can be said to have been committed by a person who offers or promises any person with the object directly or indirectly of inducing to vote at the election for that person; and the passage at page 6 of the issue of "Tamanna" dated February 10, 1967, attributes this corrupt practice to the petitioner. It is, therefore, clear that out of the three impugned passages in this issue of "Tamanna", two are certainly objectionable in the sense that they attribute commission of corrupt practices to the petitioner and are attacks against the personal character of the petitioner. The petitioner himself has stated in the witness box that these statements are false and no attempt has been made on behalf of the first respondent to show that there is any truth in the allegations set out at page 2 that the petitioner had offered any consideration to Ramesh Parmar to withdraw his candidature or that the petitioner had distributed packets of sweet-meats amongst the voters in his constituency with the object of obtaining votes. It may be pointed out that in his evidence the first respondent has stated:—

"There is in one of the extracts in Ex. "E" satirical references to the petitioner. According to me what is written in this extract against the petitioner is not in good taste. This particular portion written against the petitioner sets out the views of the editor regarding the alliance between the petitioner and the Swatantra Party. I am not connected in any manner with the editorial policy or writing so far as "Tamanna" is concerned. It is not true that this passage in "Tamanna" has been written at my instance or at my suggestion."

In the light of the authorities of the Supreme Court, it is clear that at least two out of the impugned passages amounts to false statements against the personal character of the respondent and looking to the fact that these statements were made at the time when the election campaign of the rival candidates was going on, it is not unreasonable to infer that these statements were reasonably calculated to prejudice the prospects of the petitioner's election.

The question now arises whether this publication of the false statements was by the first respondent or his agent or by any person with the consent of the first respondent or his Election Agent. It is the petitioner's case that the first respondent distributed copies of this issue of "Tamanna" to various persons at different places in his constituency. In this connection, the petitioner has led the evidence of four witnesses, viz., Chhanabhai Virabhai Rathod, petitioner's witness No. 4, Jivanlal Somsbhai Vaghela, petitioner's witness No. 8, Nanjibhai Kalidas Rathod, petitioner's witness No. 9 and Mithabhai Ambaram Parmar, Petitioner's witness No. 13; and each of these witnesses has stated in his deposition that the first respondent had distributed copies of "Tamanna" of 10th February 1967, in the respective areas. Regarding these witnesses, an objection was urged before me on behalf of the first respondent regarding the want of particulars in the petition so far as this particular corrupt practice is concerned. In the petition it has been alleged that this issue of "Tamanna" was distributed throughout the constituency by respondent No. 1 himself and by his workers with the consent of respondent No. 1. It is true that in the petition different places at which these copies were distributed by the first respondent and the dates on which the copies were distributed by the first respondent have not been mentioned. Under S.83(b) of the Act, it has been laid down that an election petition shall set forth full particulars of any corrupt practice that the petitioner alleges, including as full a statement as possible of the names of the parties alleged to have committed such corrupt practice and the date and place of the commission of each such practice. Mr. Shah, on behalf of the first respondent, relied in this connection on the decision of the Supreme Court in *Bhikhaji Keshao Joshi v. P. N. Niyani* 10 Election Law Reports 357, where the Supreme Court has laid down that the requirement of full particulars of all corrupt practices alleged in the petition including the names of the parties and the date and place of commission, enjoined by S. 83(2) must be complied with, with sufficient fullness and clarification, so as to enable the opposite party fairly to meet them; and they must be such as not to turn the enquiry into a rambling and roving inquisition. It is a fact that nowhere in the petition



is there any mention of the date of place regarding the distribution of copies of "Tamanna" of 10th February, 1967 by the first respondent; but no plea was taken in the written statement that the particulars regarding this particular corrupt practice by the first respondent were inadequate. In para 14 of the written statement the first respondent has stated that it is not true that the first respondent or his agent with the consent of the first respondent have published false statements, knowing them to be false and not believing them to be true, in relation to the personal character, conduct and candidature of the petitioner and with a view to prejudice the election prospects of the petitioner. It is also stated in the same para:

"It is not true that during the election days, fortnightly 'Tamanna' was freely circulated or distributed throughout the constituency by the respondent or by his agents and workers with the consent of the respondent."

Though a grievance of want of particulars regarding the reception of votes etc. has been made, there is no grievance made in the written statement regarding the want of particulars in regard to the corrupt practice of distributing this issue of "Tamanna". Moreover, at the time when the evidence was being led, no objection was raised on the ground that these particulars were not furnished in the petition or by any subsequent amendment to the petition.

In *Balwant Singh v. Lakshmi Narain*, A.I.R. 1960 S.C. 770 the question of particulars was gone into by the Supreme Court and Shah J. delivering the judgment of the Supreme Court has stated in para (8), at page 774 of the report as follows:—

"The practice to be followed in cases where insufficient particulars of a corrupt practice are set forth in an election petition is this. An election petition is liable to be dismissed *in limine* merely because full particulars of a corrupt practice alleged in the petition are not set out. Where an objection is raised by the respondent that a petition is defective because full particulars of an alleged corrupt practice are not set out, the Tribunal is bound to decide whether the objection, is well-founded. If the Tribunal upholds the objection, it should give an opportunity to the petitioner to apply for leave to amend or amplify the particulars of the corrupt practice alleged, and in the event of non-compliance with that order the Tribunal may strike out the charges which remain vague. Insistence upon full particulars of corrupt practices is undoubtedly of paramount importance in the trial of an election petition, but if the parties go to trial despite the absence of full particulars of the corrupt practice alleged, and evidence of the contesting parties is led on the plea raised by the petition, the petition cannot thereafter be dismissed for want of particulars, because the defect is one of procedure and not one of jurisdiction of the Tribunal to adjudicate upon the plea in the absence of particulars. The Appellate Court may be justified in setting aside the judgment of the Tribunal if it is satisfied that by reason of the absence of full particulars, material prejudice has resulted; and in considering whether material prejudice has resulted failure to raise and press the objection about the absence of particulars before going to trial must be given due weight."

In the instant case, it is obvious that the allegation being regarding what was published in the issue of "Tamanna" dated February 10, 1967, and the date of the poll being February 21, 1967, by necessary implication it follows that the distribution by the first respondent could only have been between February 10, 1967 and February 21, 1967. Therefore the time at which or the interval of time during which this distribution is attributed to the first respondent can be fixed with reasonable certainty *viz.* between February 10, 1967 and February 21, 1967. It is further alleged in the petition that this distribution took place in the constituency. Since this is a parliamentary constituency, thereby covering a large area, it is obvious that particulars of places should have been given and the petitioner could have been compelled to give these particulars regarding the places at which the distribution by the first respondent took place, if the first respondent had insisted on such particulars at the appropriate time. As the evidence on the record shows, Naranbhai Nathebhaj Vora, an agent of the petitioner had collected all the details regarding the different instances, where the first respondent had distributed copies of this issue of "Tamanna" and according to Naranbhai Nathabhai Vora, petitioner's witness No. 19, he had informed the petitioner about these instances before the petition was filed.

Therefore, at the time when the petition was filed, the petitioner was in full possession of the different particulars regarding places at which the first respondent distributed copies of "Tamanna"; and the question that I have now to consider is whether because of want of full particulars regarding the places at which copies of "Tamanna" are said to have been distributed by the first respondent, any material prejudice has been caused to the first respondent. No attempt has been made on behalf of the first respondent to lead any rebutting evidence against the witnesses who have deposed regarding the distribution of the said copies at the hands of the first respondent and further no application for time to enable the first respondent to lead any such evidence was at all made before me. Under these circumstances, I fail to see what prejudice can be said to have been caused to the first respondent because full particulars contemplated by S 83(20) regarding the places at which the copies of "Tamanna" were distributed by the first respondent were not set out in the petition. In view of the decision of the Supreme Court in Balwan Singh's case (Supra), it cannot be said that the evidence led by the petitioner regarding the distribution of the copies of "Tamanna" must be discarded because particulars in that behalf have not been set out in the petition.

Coming now to the evidence of the Witnesses, who speak about the distribution of the copies of "Tamanna", Chhanabhai Virabhai Rathod, petitioner's Witness No. 4, is a resident of Dehgam village and according to this witness, about 6 or 7 days prior to the date of the poll, he had gone to village Nadol from Dehgam in order to attend a meeting of the Caste Panch. Chhanabhai is one of the members of the Caste Panch. The first respondent and his workers had come to Nadol on that day. Chhanabhai saw one Jayantibhai and one Vithalbhai amongst the workers of the first respondent. He said that the issue of "Tamanna" in which Ex. "E" appears was distributed at Nadol. In his examination-in-chief, this witness identified the issue of "Tamanna", dated February 10, 1967, without the use of spectacles but in his cross-examination he stated that he could not read without the assistance of spectacles. In view of this particular aspect, it is difficult for me to rely on the word of this witness that the first respondent had distributed copies of the issue of "Tamanna", dated February 10, 1967, at Nadol; and on the evidence of Chhanabhai it is difficult to hold that this aspect of the case has been established by the petitioner.

Nanjibhai Kalidas Rathod, Petitioner's Witness No. 9, is also a resident of Dehgam. Dehgam is included in Gandhinagar Lok-Sabha Constituency. Nanjibhai has stated in his deposition that on one occasion he was passing by the Library at Dehgam. At that time the first respondent, Jayantibhai Subodh and others were sitting in that library. Jayantibhai called Nanjibhai inside the library and asked him who he was and where he was working. Nanjibhai gave his name and told Jayantibhai that he was working in a textile mill. Jayantibhai then told Nanjibhai that he should vote for the Congress Party candidates and that he should vote for the Congress symbol of a pair of bullocks with a yoke on. Jayantibhai also gave to this witness a copy of one of the issues of "Tamanna", dated February 10, 1967. Now, this distribution is by Jayantibhai and not by the first respondent. The first respondent is alleged to have been present at that time but the evidence of this witness it cannot be said that it was the first respondent who distributed a copy of this issue of "Tamanna", dated February 10, 1967. The evidence of Nanjibhai, therefore, cannot help the petitioner in establishing that the first respondent had distributed copies of "Tamanna", dated February 10, 1967.

Jivanlal Somabhai Vaghela, Petitioner's Witness No. 8, has stated in his deposition that he resides in Vijaynagar Housing Society, Kankaria, Ahmedabad which area is included in Gandhinagar Lok-Sabha Constituency. According to Jivanlal, about six or seven days before the polling day, the first respondent one Jethalal Jadav and Jayantilal Subodh had come to his Housing Society and they were accompanied by 40 other persons. The witness then corrected himself and said that only the first respondent, Jayantilal Subodh and Jethalal Jadav had come to their Housing Society and the residents of the society were called to the meeting and in all about 40 persons had attended that meeting. Jayantilal had come to the House of Jivanlal to call him to attend the meeting. According to Jivanlal, at the meeting first Jayantilal then Jethalal Jadav and lastly the first respondent spoke. After the speeches were over, a booklet published by the Backward Classes Voters' Council and some issues of journal "Tamanna" were distributed amongst those who had attended the meeting. This witness knew how to read and write as he had studied upto 6th std. Gujarati. The witness also stated that

if the copy of the particular issue of "Tamanna" were shown to him, he would be able to identify the same and he picked up the issue of "Tamanna" which was distributed at the meeting. According to this witness, a copy of the issue of "Tamanna" of 10th February, 1967, was given to him by the first respondent. In his cross-examination this witness stated that on the date on which the meeting was held, he was working in the day-shift of Rohit Mills and he was working from 7 A.M. to 3.30 P.M. and the meeting was held in the evening. This witness has stated that he had talked to Naranbhai Vora about that meeting two days prior to the date of the poll and at that time he had told Naranbhai that copies of the particular issue of "Tamanna" had been distributed after the speeches were over at that meeting. He had not shown to Naranbhai any copy of the issue of "Tamanna" that had been so distributed but he had told Naranbhai orally about it. In this cross-examination Jivanlal has stated that he belonged to the Chamar Sub-caste of Harijans and he did not know to which particular sub-caste the petitioner belonged. The petitioner himself has stated that he also belongs to Chamar sub-caste of Harijans. It was urged before me on behalf of the first respondent that I should not accept the evidence of Jivanlal because he belonged to the same sub-caste of Harijans i.e. Chamar, as the petitioner, and that he had come to give false evidence in this case. Now, I have watched the demeanour on this witness when he was in the witness-box and I have found that he was giving his evidence in a straight forward manner. His demeanour has struck me as that of a truthful witness. Moreover, nothing has been brought out in his cross-examination, which would induce me to hold that Jivanlal was not a witness of truth. On Jivanlal's evidence I am prepared to hold that the first respondent had distributed the issue of "Tamanna" of February 10, 1967 at Vijayanagar Housing Society, Kankaria, and that this distribution took place about 6 or 7 days prior to the date of the poll.

Regarding witness Nithabhai Ambaram Parmar, petitioner's witness No. 13, an attempt was made to elicit in his cross-examination that he was a partisan of the petitioner inasmuch as he had joined the petitioner in his "Satyagraha" for breaking open the locks at the Sachivalaya at Hyderabad but he has denied that suggestion. In fairness it was pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioner, so as not to cause any prejudice to the witness, that the "Satyagraha" was not for breaking open the locks but for putting the locks on the Sachivalaya at Ahmedabad. Though the answer is technically correct, the witness was a person who was taking part in this activity carried on by the petitioner. Mithabhai has deposed about the first respondent distributing copies of "Tamanna" dated February 10, 1967 to the residents of the chawl where Mithabhai was residing. If Mithabhai had not been a partisan witness, I would have relied upon his testimony but in view of the fact that he is a partisan witness and hence likely to favour the petitioner, I am unable to rely upon the testimony of Mithabhai for the purpose of holding that the first respondent had distributed copies of "Tamanna" dated February 10, 1967.

Under these circumstances on the evidence of Jivanlal Somabhai Vaghela, I hold that at least on one occasion at the time of the meeting at Vijayanagar Housing Society, the first respondent had distributed copies of the issue of "Tamanna" dated 10th February 1967, which contained the impugned material which I have already set out. The first respondent was at that time carrying on election propaganda on his own behalf and the petitioner was a rival candidate. The only object, therefore, in distributing the copies of the issue of "Tamanna" could have been to further his own election prospects and to mar the election prospects of the petitioner.

Mr. Shah, on behalf of the first respondent, in this connection relied upon the observations of the Supreme Court in *Sheopal Singh v. Ram Pratap*, A.I.R. 1965 S.C. 677 to the effect that S. 123(4) of the Act does not accept the doctrine of constructive knowledge. Mr. Shah urged before me that there is nothing to show on the record of this case that the first respondent knew about the contents of the issue of "Tamanna", dated February, 10, 1967, or that with that knowledge he distributed those copies. This contention of Mr. Shah cannot be accepted because it is not unreasonable to infer that the petitioner himself distributed the said copies looking to the fact that it was in the course of the election campaign and particularly when such distribution was going to further his own election campaign. No other object can be attributed to the first respondent for distributing the copies of this issue of 10th February 1967 at the meeting at Vijayanagar Society. I, therefore, hold that the respondent himself distributed copies of "Tamanna" of 10th February, 1967 and thereby published false statements regarding the petitioner, at least so far as two of those statements are concerned. These statements were regarding the personal character of the petitioner and are statements which can reasonably

be said to be calculated to prejudice the petitioner's election. Under these circumstances, the first respondent committed this corrupt practice set out in S. 123(4) of the Act.

It was urged on behalf of the petitioner before me that even apart from the first respondent himself, Jayantibhai Subodh, who was the Counting Agent of the first respondent, being the editor, printer and publisher of "Tamanna", had published false statements regarding the personal character of the petitioner and, therefore, the first respondent is responsible for the same. In this connection it was urged that respondent No. 1 was at one time a member of the Advisory Board of "Tamanna" in 1963. Further, it was urged that Subodh was working for respondent No. 1's election and a lifesketch of the father of respondent No. 1 and the news about the death of his father were published in the issue of "Tamanna" journal. Moreover, it was urged that Subodh was a leading member of the Ahmedabad City Backward Classes voters' Council, which was working for the first respondent and other Congress candidate, and Jayantibhai Subodh and the first respondent were moving about together at the time of the election campaign. At the time when counting was going on, Jayantibhai Subodh had admittedly worked as the Counting Agent of the first respondent. It is, therefore, urged that the publication by Jayantibhai Subodh should be held to be a publication with the consent of the first respondent Under S. 123(4) of the Act, any publication by an agent of the candidate, of any statement of fact which is false, and which he either believes to be false or does not believe to be true, in relation to the personal character, conduct and candidature of any candidate, being a statement reasonably calculated to prejudice the prospects of that candidate's election, is sufficient to bring it within the corrupt practice referred to in S. 100(1)(b) of the Act; and the Court must come to the conclusion that the corrupt practice had been committed by the returned candidate or his agent. Even if this argument that Jayantibhai Subodh as the agent of the first respondent had published this issue of "Tamanna", dated February 10, 1967 were to be accepted it cannot be said to amount to the commission of the corrupt practice defined in S. 123(4) by the returned candidate or by any other person with the consent of the returned candidate or his election agent. It is possible that Subodh himself on his own responsibility and in his enthusiasm to support the cause of the Congress candidate, viz., the first respondent, published these passages in the issue of "Tamanna" of 10th February 1967, and not as the agent of the first respondent. Simply because Subodh was the counting agent of the first respondent, it cannot be said that he was also his agent at the time when he published the issue of "Tamanna" dated February, 10, 1967.

In Issue No. 5, I have to deal with Jethalal Bhavanbhai Jadav. Under S. 123(7) of the Act, obtaining or procuring or abetting or attempting to obtain or procure by a candidate or his agent or by any other person with the consent of a candidate or his election agent, any assistance (other than the giving of vote) for the furtherance of the prospects of that candidate's election, from any person in the service of the Government and belonging to any of the following classes is a corrupt practice namely:—

- “(f) revenue officers other than village revenue officers known as lambar-dars, malguzars, patels, deshmuks or by any other name, whose duty is to collect land revenue and who are remunerated by a share of, or commission on, the amount of land revenue collected by them but who do not discharge any police functions”

Regarding Jethalal B. Jadav, the averment in the petition is as follows:—

“The petitioner submits that respondent No. 1, his agents and other persons with the consent of respondent No. 1 have committed a corrupt practice of obtaining or producing or attempting to obtain or procure assistance for the furtherance of the prospect of respondent No. 1's election from the persons in the service of the Government and belonging to the category of Gazetted Officer, Members of Armed Forces, Members of the Police Force and Revenue Officers discharging the police functions. Some of the instances thereof are as under:—

- (a) Shri Jethalal B. Jadav, who is in the Income-tax Department of the Government of India and who is presently posted at Ahmedabad in Circle II of the Income-tax office was working and canvassing for the election of respondent No. 1.”

Now, it has come out in the evidence before me that there are at least two workers amongst the Harijan Community in Ahmedabad both with the name of Jethalal B. Jadav, and both are taking part in the social activities of this community. One is Jethalal Bhavanbhai Jadav. He is an employee of the Income-Tax Department holding a substantive post of a peon and officiating as a Lower Division Clerk since December 13, 1963. The other person is Jethalal Becharbhai Jadav, also known as "Vyayam Veer", because he is interested in athletics; and it is contended that Jethalal Bhavanbhai Jadav, the employee of the Income-Tax Department, was closely connected with the election campaign of the first respondent and the first respondent had obtained or procured the assistance of Jethalal Bhavanbhai Jadav in his election campaign.

The first respondent has examined Narottamdas Shamjibhai Purabia, Respondent's witness No 2. This person is an educated man having passed M.Sc. Examination of the Gujarat University and he has also passed M.Sc. from one of the Universities in the United States of America. According to this witness it is Jethalal B. Jadav, "Vyayam Veer", who is the Secretary of the Ahmedabad City Backward Classes Voters' Council and the person who is shown as the Secretary in Ex. "G" is Jethalal Becharbhai Jadav. This witness also stated in his evidence that he knew Jethalal B. Jadav the employee of the Income-Tax Department was not connected in any manner with the voters' Council. He further stated that Jethalal B. Jadav, the employee of the Income-Tax Department, is the President of the Ideal Welfare Society. Jethalal Becharbhai Jadav is also one of the members of the Ideal Welfare Society; and this witness denied the suggestion that Jethalal Bhavanbhai Jadav had taken a leading part in the Ahmedabad City Backward Classes Voter's Council. I accept Purabia's version coming as it does from a responsible source and hold that Jethalal Bhavanbhai Jadav, the employee of the Income-Tax Department, was not the Secretary of the Ahmedabad City Backward Classes Voters' Council but at the same time in view of the fact that Purabia worked for the first respondent in his election campaign, he cannot altogether be said to be free from the taint of partisanship; and under these circumstances, as regards his assertion that Jethalal Bhavanbhai Jadav had not taken any part in the work of the Ahmedabad City Backward Classes Voters' Council. I will have to take that evidence with a bit of caution.

Another witness on the record of this case, viz., Chaturbhai Nathubhai Parmar, Petitioner's witness No 16, who is a student studying for M.A. and LL.B., and who is actively connected with the Congress Party, being a member of that party, has stated in his evidence that he knew both Jethalal Bhavanbhai Jadav, employee of the Income-Tax Department, and Jethalal Becharbhai Jadav, "Vyayam Veer", since both of them were residing in the Co-operative Housing Society where Chaturbhai was residing. According to Chaturbhai, it was Jethalal Bhavanbhai Jadav, employee of the Income-Tax Department, who was associated with the Ahmedabad City Backward Classes Voter's Council and not Jethalal Becharbhai Jadav, the "Vyayam Veer". According to Chaturbhai, Jethalal Becharbhai Jadav was not connected with any political party, nor was he participating in the Ahmedabad City Backward Classes Voters' Council; and he has also referred to the short speech delivered by Jethalal B. Jadav, employee of the Income Tax Department, held in Ganpat Housing Society. This witness Chaturbhai appeared to me to be a sincere person out to speak the truth and his demeanour has also struck me as that of a truthful witness. He has no axe to grind. On the contrary, he was a supporter of the Congress Party as shown by the membership receipt, which he produced when he was being cross-examined. It was urged before me on behalf of the first respondent that Chaturbhai belonged to the same sub-caste as the petitioner and, therefore, he had come to depose falsely in favour of a fellow member of his own sub-caste. I am unable to accept this contention because nothing has been brought on the record to show that Chaturbhai was in any way related to or in any way interested in the petitioner. The petitioner has led evidence of other witnesses as well to show that Jethalal B. Jadav, employee of the Income Tax Department, was working for the petitioner, Jivanlal, whose evidence I have found acceptable in connection with the distribution of the issue of "Tamanna", has stated in his deposition that at the meeting held at Vijayanagar Housing Society, Jethalal B. Jadav the Income-Tax employee, had addressed the meeting along with Jayantibhai Subodh and the first respondent. In his cross-examination he stated that he knew Jethalal Bhavanbhai Jadav of the Income-Tax Department. Jivanlal knew him because Jethalal was associated with various social activities. Jivanlal denied the suggestion that he had falsely mentioned the name Jethalal Bhavanbhai Jadav in connection with the meeting of the

Vijayanagar Society. Thus, this witness also establishes the fact that Jethalal Bhavanbhai Jadav, in the company of the first respondent, had visited Vijayanagar Society and had addressed the meeting at that Society.

Babulal Gandadal Parmer, Petitioner's witness No. 10 has deposed about the formation of the Backward Classes Voters' Council. According to Babulal, at a function held on January 4, 1967 a proposal was mooted for the formation of the Council and that proposal was carried out at that meeting. Jethalal B. Jadav, the employee of the Income Tax Department, had spoken at that meeting. But the evidence of this witness Babulal does not establish the fact that Jethalal B. Jadav, the employee of the Income-Tax Department, had in any way assisted the first respondent in his election campaign.

Jayantibhai Ambaram Subodh. Petitioner's witness No. 12, has denied the suggestion that Jethalal B. Jadav, the employee of the Income-Tax Department, was connected in any manner with the Ahmedabad City Backward Classes Voters' Council; but since he is a partisan witness, his evidence cannot help the first respondent in any manner.

Ganpatbhai Mangaldas Parmer, Petitioner's witness No. 18, has also stated about Jethalal B. Jadav, Jayantibhai Subodh and the first respondent visiting the Chawl at Rakhial, where Ganpatbhai was residing and according to this witness, Jethalal B. Jadav, the first respondent and his workers had distributed copies of the booklet, Ex. "G", and in reply to a question put by the Court, he stated that he knew Jethalal B. Jadav, the employee of the Income-Tax Department. It is only on the evidence of Jivanlal, Petitioner's witness No. 8, out of all these witnesses, that it can be held that Jethalal Bhavanbhai Jadav, the employee of the Income-Tax Department had accompanied the first respondent at the time when a meeting was held at Vyayanagar Society and that this Jethalal B. Jadav had spoken at that meeting. It is, therefore, clear that Jethalal B. Jadav, the employee of the Income-Tax Department had to that extent assisted the first respondent in his election campaign.

The question then arises whether Jethalal Bhavanbhai Jadav is a Revenue Officer within the meaning of S. 123(7). It is clear in the context of S. 123(7) of Act that the Income-Tax Officers and Officers above the Income-Tax Officers like the Appellate Assistant Commissioners, Inspecting Assistant Commissioners and Commissioners are all Gazetted Officers and they would fall in Clause (a) of S. 123(7). Therefore that term "Revenue Officers" must be read separately from "Gazetted Officers" occurring in Cl. (a) of S. 123(7) of the Act. "An Officer" does not necessarily mean any employee designated as such but any holder of an office can be said to be "an officer". For example, under the Code of Criminal Procedure, even a Police Constable or a Head Constable, who may be in charge of a Police Station, is referred to as an Officer-in-Charge of a Police Station though ordinarily a Police Constable or a Head Constable is not referred to as an Officer of the Police Force. It is true that in clauses (c) and (d), members of the Armed Forces of the Union and the members of the Police Forces are mentioned and if the Legislature had not intended it could have said "all members of the revenue services of India" but the Legislature has referred only to Revenue Officers. "Revenue" does not necessarily mean "land revenue" but any revenue either of the State or of the Union and if there is any Officer i.e., holder of any post discharging the functions concerned with the collection or assessment of revenue, then he would be a revenue officer within the meaning of S. 123(7)(f) of the Act.

In *Sheopatsingh v. Narishchandra*—A.I.R. 1958 Rajasthan 324 Wanchoo C. J. and Jagat Narayan J. have held that the Representation of the People Act, 1951, is an all India Act and there is no reason to give a restricted meaning to the word 'revenue' as used in this Act and confine it to land revenue, as it is done in the Rajasthan Tenancy Act. This word has been used in a wider sense and the term "Revenue Officer" should be taken to mean any officer employed in the business of any sort of revenue by the Union or the States. This definition will thus include non-gazetted officers of all the departments dealing with Union or State Revenue. The term "Revenue Officer" will thus include such officers of the Income-tax, Sales Tax and Irrigation Department as well as the Land Revenue Department, who are employed in the business of revenue. In that particular case, the Division Bench of the Rajasthan High Court held that a Reader of the Colonisation Tahsildar whose duty is to allot Government Lands to tenants and to fix rent on them is a Revenue Officer within the meaning of the Act. So, also an Irrigation Patwari whose duty is to maintain records with the help of which

irrigation dues are collected is a Revenue Officer. So far as a Lower Division Clerk of the Income Tax Department is concerned, Parshuram Baburao Bhatkar, Petitioner's witness No. 1 who is working as Head Clerk in the Income Tax Office at Ahmedabad has stated that Jethalal B. Jadav has been officiating as a Lower Division Clerk since December 13, 1963. According to this witness, a Lower Division Clerk in his Department generally is in charge of Inward and Outward despatch work. He is also in charge of filing and maintenance of case record of the different assessees. He also fixes up the appointments for the assessee with the Income Tax Officers and his Superior Officers and hands over the written intimation to the notice servers in the Department. A Lower Division Clerk also attends to the general typing work and the work of maintenance of registers is also entrusted to him. Over and above these kinds of work, a lower division clerk attends to such other work as may be assigned to him by his Superior Officers. From the description of the work which a Lower Division Clerk in the Income Tax Department has to attend, it is clear that he is in charge of maintenance of registers and other records of the Department and thus it is clear that a Lower Division Clerk, like Jethalal Bhabanbhai Jadav, is a holder of an Office in connection with the assessment or collection of revenue viz., income tax. Under these circumstances, in the light of the decision of the Rajasthan High Court in *Sheopatsingh's case* (*supra*), with which I respectfully agree, this employee Jethalal B. Jadav can be said to be a Revenue Officer within the meaning of S 123(7)(f) of the Act.

However, the question that I have to consider is whether the first respondent obtained or procured assistance of Jethalal Bhavanbhai Jadav for the furtherance of the prospects of his election. What Jethalal Bhavanbhai Jadav spoke at that meeting at Vijaynagar Housing Society is not on the record of this case. The fact that Jethalal Bhavanbhai Jadav, the employee of the Income Tax Department, was connected with certain activities of the Ahmedabad City Backward Classes Voters' Council can be accepted in view of the evidence of Chaturbhai but whether that assistance was for the furtherance of the election of the first respondent has not been established on the record of this case. The fact that the Ahmedabad City Backward Classes Voters' Council was generally working in support of all Congress candidate, as shown by the booklet, Ex. "G", does not necessarily mean that this Jethalal Bhavanbhai Jadav was working for the furtherance of the prospects of the first respondent's election and that lacuna appears in the evidence led by the petitioner. Under these circumstances though I accept the petitioner's evidence that Jethalal Bhavanbhai Jadav, the employee of the Income Tax Department, was connected with the Ahmedabad City Backward Classes Voters' Council and though I further accept the evidence that, he spoke at the meeting held at Vijaynagar Housing Society at the time of the election campaign of the first respondent, it is not possible for me to hold that that assistance was for the furtherance of the prospects of the first respondent's election. It is for the petitioner to establish beyond reasonable doubt all the ingredients of this particular corrupt practice and this particular corrupt practice of assistance of a revenue officer for the furtherance of the prospects of the first respondent's election has not been established from the evidence led by the petitioner. The result, therefore, is that Issue No. 5 must be decided against the petitioner and in favour of respondent No. 1.

At one stage of the evidence, the petitioner wanted to establish that respondent No. 1 had committed the corrupt practice of bribery inasmuch as either he or his agent or other persons with his consent gave a gift and gratification to respondent No. 2 for standing at the election, but in view of the evidence of Yeshwantra Tukaram Indulkar, Petitioner's witness No. 7, the learned counsel for the petitioner has not pressed this particular corrupt practice.

In the light of the above discussion, I answer the issues as follows:—

- |               |   |  |
|---------------|---|--|
| Issue No. (1) | : | Not pressed.                                 |
| Issue No. (2) | : | Not pressed.                                 |
| Issue No. (3) | : | Not pressed.                                 |
| Issue No. (4) | : | Not pressed.                                 |
| Issue No. (5) | : | In the negative; Second part does not arise. |

Issue No. (6)	:	In the affirmative as to both parts.
Issue No. (7)	:	In the negative.
Issue No. (8)	:	Not pressed.
Issue No. (9)	:	In view of S. 100(1)(b) of the Act, it is clear that the election of respondent No. 1 is void.
Issue No. (10)	:	Does not arise.

In view of the fact that the petitioner has succeeded only on one issue and has given up on issue after leading evidence in that behalf and has lost on the other issue regarding Jethalal B. Jadav, in my opinion, the petitioner should be paid the costs but while fixing the costs, Advocates' fees should be fixed at Rs. 500/- (Five hundred).

After the judgment was delivered, Mr Shah, on behalf of the first respondent, applied for stay of the operation of this order, during the time that he might take to file an appeal before the Supreme Court. Under S. 116B of the Act, I grant stay of operation of this order for a period of six weeks from the date of supply of the certified copy of the judgement in this matter. Mr. Shah, on behalf of the first respondent, undertakes that during the period of stay his client will not attend any session of the Lok Sabha, except to save disqualification, or work in any capacity as the member of the Lok Sabha. The first respondent through his counsel also undertakes not to draw any remuneration as a member of the Parliament till further orders are obtained from the Supreme Court.

(13th November 1967)

On the application of Mr. S. M. Shah, on behalf of the first respondent, the order passed regarding stay pending appeal to the Supreme Court is modified to this extent that the first respondent will be permitted to sign the Daily Register of attendance at the Lok Sabha but will not participate in any other manner in the work of the Lok Sabha nor draw any remuneration as the member of the Lok Sabha till further orders.

By the order of the Court,

Sd/- M. A. SYED/28.11

Deputy Registrar(I)

dated this 28th day of November, 1967.

Sd/-

Deputy Registrar

High Court of Gujarat

Ahmedabad-9.

14.12.

[No. 82/23/67.]

By Order,

K. S. RAJAGOPALAN, Secy.

## MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 18th March 1968

**S.O. 1009.**—In pursuance of clause (1) of article 239 of the Constitution and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Home Affairs No. S.R.O. 1531, dated the 14th May, 1957, the President hereby directs that the Administrator of every Union territory (whether known as Administrator, Chief Commissioner or Lieutenant Governor) shall, subject to the control of the President and until further orders, also exercise the powers and discharge the functions of the Central Government under section 7 of the Explosive Substances Act, 1908 (6 of 1908), within that Union territory.

[No. F. 2/5/68-UTL.]

P. N. KAUL, Dy. Secy



**MINISTRY OF HEALTH, FAMILY PLANNING AND U.D.**

(Department of Health)

*New Delhi, the 9th March 1968*

**S.O. 1010.**—Whereas the Central Government have, in pursuance of the provisions of clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), nominated in consultation with the Government of Maharashtra, Dr. D. V. Virkar, Surgeon-General with the Government of Maharashtra, to be a member of the Medical Council of India with effect from the 7th March, 1968 vice Dr. P. M. Bhandarkar resigned;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Health No F 513/59-MI, dated the 9th January, 1960, namely:—

In the said notification, under the heading “Nominated under clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 3”, for the entry against serial No. 5, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

“Dr. D. V. Vikar, Surgeon-General with the Government of Maharashtra, Bombay”.

[No. F.4-28/57-MPT.]

L. K. MURTHY, Under Secy.

**MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT & SHIPPING**

(Transport Wing)

*New Delhi, the 12th March 1968*

**S.O. 1011.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by paragraph 37 of the Seamen's Provident Fund Scheme, 1966, and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Department of Transport and Shipping) (Transport Wing) No. S.O. 230, dated the 9th January, 1967, the Central Government, after consulting the Board of Trustees of the Seamen's Provident Fund and having regard to the resources of the Fund available for meeting its normal administrative expenses, hereby fixes, with effect from the 1st April, 1968, the administrative charges payable under paragraph 35 of the said Scheme, at 3 per cent (three per cent).

[No. 5-MT(2)/68.]

K. V. SANKARAN, Dy. Secy.

**MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING**

*New Delhi, the 8th March 1968*

**S.O. 1012.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5(1) of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 and sub-rule (3) of rule 8 read with sub-rule 2 of rule 9 of the

Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules, 1958, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Kota Punniah after consultation with Central Board of Film Censors, as a member of the Advisory Panel of the said Board at Madras with immediate effect.

[No. F. 11/3/68-FC.]

H. C. KHANNA, Dy. Secy.

## MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT & COMPANY AFFAIRS

(Department of Industrial Development)

*New Delhi, the 16th March 1968*

**S.O. 1013.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952 (36 of 1952), read with rule 13 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Rules, 1955, and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India, in the late Ministry of Industry and Supply (Department of Industry) No. S.O. 4103 dated the 27th November, 1964, the Central Government, in consultation with the Indian Standards Institution, hereby directs that any powers exercisable by the said Institution under Clause (e) of section 3 of the said Act, shall be exercisable also by the Indian Jute Industries Research Association (IJIRA), Calcutta in respect of Jute products manufactured by Mills situated in the following states:—

- (1) Andhra Pradesh,
- (2) Bihar,
- (3) Madhya Pradesh,
- (4) Uttar Pradesh, and
- (5) West Bengal.

[File No. 39(81)-PP&D/67.]

K. BALACHANDRAN, Jt. Secy.

## श्रीद्योगिक विकास तथा समवाय-कार्य मंत्रालय

(श्रीद्योगिक विकास विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 16 मार्च 1968

**एस० ओ० 1014.**—भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणीकरण चिह्न) अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 36) की धारा 10 उपधारा (1) के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए

भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणीकरण विज्ञान) अधिनियम, 1955 के नियम 13 के साथ पढ़ते हुए तथा भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व उद्योग तथा संभरण मंत्रालय (उद्योग विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या एम० ओ० 4103, दिनांक 27 नवम्बर 1964 का अधिलिखन करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय मानक संस्था के परामर्श से एतद्वारा यह निदेश देती है कि उपर्युक्त अधिनियम के खण्ड 3 उप खण्ड (ऊ) के अन्तर्गत संस्था द्वारा प्रयुक्त की जाने वाली सभी शक्तियाँ निम्नलिखित राज्यों में स्थित जूट उत्पादों का निर्माण करने वाली मिलों के सम्बन्ध में भारतीय जूट उद्योग अनुसंधान संघ (आई० जी० आई० आर० ए०) कदकता द्वारा भी लागू की जायेगी :—

1. आन्ध्र प्रदेश,
2. बिहार,
3. मध्य प्रदेश,
4. उत्तर प्रदेश, तथा
5. पश्चिम बंगाल ।

[सं० 39(81) पी० पी० एण्ड डी०/67]

के० बालचन्द्रन्, संयुक्त सचिव ।

(Department of Industrial Development)

(Indian Standards Institution)

New Delhi, the 6th March 1968

**S.O. 1015.**—The article covered in licence No. CM/L-1544 held by The Hind Iron Foundry, Railway Road, Batala, the details of which are given in the Notification published under S.O. 4258 in the Gazette of India, Part II—Section 3(ii) dated 9th December 1967 has been revised as under with effect from 1st February 1968:

Sand Cast Iron Soil Pipes up to 100 mm size Brand: 'HIND'.

[No. MD/12-2431.]

A. K. GUPTA,

Deputy Director General.

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION**

(P. &amp; T. Board)

*New Delhi, the 12th March 1968*

**S.O. 1016.**—In pursuance of para (2) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director-General, Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specifies the 1st April, 1968 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in Sonapat Telephone Exchange.

[No. 5/29/68-PHB(3).]

**D. R. BAHL,**

Assistant Director General (PHB)

**संचार विभाग**

(डाक-तार बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 12 मार्च 1968

**एस० ओ० 1017.**—स्थायी आदेश क्रमसंख्या 627 दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किये गए 1951 के भारतीय तार नियमों के नियम 434 के खण्ड III के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-तार महानिदेशक ने सोनीपत टेलीफोन केन्द्र में 1-4-68 से प्रमाणित दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निश्चय किया है।

[सं० 5-29/68-पी० एच० बी०(3)]

डी० आर० बहल,

सहायक महानिदेशक (पी० एच० बी०)।

**CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES****CORRIGENDUM***New Delhi, the 18th March 1968*

**S.O. 1018.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 126 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following amendment to the Schedule annexed to its Notification No. 1 (F. No. 55/233/63-IT), dated the 18th May, 1964:—

In the said Schedule, the words "and residing" as appearing in column 2 of Serial No. 41(j) and 41(k), shall be substituted by words "and/or residing".

[No. 4 (F. No. 55/129/67-IT)]

A. RAGHAVENDRA RAO, Under Secy.

**CENTRAL BOARD OF EXCISE AND CUSTOMS****CUSTOMS***New Delhi, the 18th March 1968*

**S.O. 1019.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sections 157 and 158 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962) and of all other powers enabling it in this behalf

the Central Board of Excise and Customs hereby makes the following addition in the Table appended to its Notification No. 21 (F. No. 10/33/67-Ad. V) published as S.O. 754 in Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India dated 2nd March, 1968:—

After the existing serial number 4, the following entries shall be inserted against columns (1), (2), (3), (4) and (5) of the Table:—

"5. Class IV Staff Rs. 1.00 Rs. 1.25 Rs. 1.25 Rs. 1.50".

[No. 49 (F. No. 10/33/67-Ad. V).]

M. G. ABROL, Member.

## MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

*New Delhi, the 16th March 1968*

**S.O. 1020.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 8 of the Emblems and Names (Prevention of Improper Use) Act, 1950 (12 of 1950), the Central Government hereby directs that in the Schedule to the said Act, in item 9A, after the words "pictorial representation of" the words "Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj or" shall be inserted

[No. 13(3)Exp/Insp/67.]

M K B. BHATNAGAR, Under Secy.

### (Office of the Jt. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports)

#### ORDER

*Calcutta, the 21st February 1968*

**S.O. 1021.**—A licence No. P/SS/1593105/C/XX/23/C/C/23-24/AU-V, dated 8th February 1967 of the value of Rs. 21,000/- for import of Cellulose Acetate Butyrate Powder Virgin materials & 1st Quality Standard Products was issued to M/s. Prem Pen Products, 50/7, Sri Arbinda Road, Salkia, Howrah subject to the conditions as under:—

(a) all items imported under it shall be used only in the licence holder's factory at the address shown in the application against which the licence is issued and no portion thereof will be utilised by the licensee for a unit/purpose other than the one for which the licence in question is issued or will be sold or permitted to be utilised by any other party. The licensee shall maintain proper account of consumption and utilisation of the goods imported against the licence.

2. Thereafter, a show cause notice No. 110/66/E&L dt. 29th January 1968 was issued asking them to show cause within 15 days as to why the said licence in their favour should not be cancelled on the ground that the licence in question was obtained by mis-representation of facts in terms of Clause 9, sub-clause (a).

3 The aforesaid show-cause notice had been returned undelivered by the Postal authorities with the remarks "Company abolished, proprietor left".

4 The undersigned has carefully examined the case and has come to the conclusion that the licence in question was obtained by mis-representation of facts.

5. Having regard to what has been stated in the proceeding paragraph, the undersigned is satisfied that the licence in question should be cancelled or otherwise rendered ineffective. Therefore, the undersigned, in exercise of the powers vested in him under Clause 9 sub-clause (a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955 hereby cancel the licence No. P/SS/1593105/C/XX/23/C/C/23-24/AU-V dated 8th February, 1967 for Rs. 21,000/- issued in favour of M/s. Prem Pen Products, 50/7, Sri Arabinda Road, Salkia, Howrah.

[No 110/66/E&L.]

J. MUKHERJI,

Dy. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports  
for Jt. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports.

## (Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

## ORDER

*New Delhi, the 11th March 1968*

**S.O. 1022.**—M/s. Amortex Agencies Private Limited, Flat No. 52, Warden Court, Gowalia Tank Road, 5th Floor, Bombay-26, were granted an import licence No. P/NA/AU/1266527/C/XX/24/C/H/21-22 dated 31st March 1967 for Rs. 25,111/- (Rupees twenty-five Thousand One hundred and eleven only) for the import of Pharmaceutical Raw Materials as per list attached thereto. The licensee have now applied to this Office for the issue of a duplicate Customs Purposes copy of the said licence on the ground that the original Customs Purposes copy of the licence in question, has been misplaced/lost. It is further stated that the original Customs Purposes copy of the licence has not yet been registered with any Customs Authorities and the same was not utilised at all. The duplicate Customs Purposes copy of the licence now required by the licensee is for the full value of the licence i.e. for Rs. 25,111/-.

2. In support of their contention the licensee have filed an affidavit. I am accordingly satisfied that the original Customs Purposes copy of the said licence has been lost. Therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred under sub-clause 9(CC) of the Imports (Control) order, 1955 dated 7th December 1955 (as amended), the original Customs Purposes copy of the licence No. P/NA/AU/1266527/C/XX/24/C/H/21-22 dated 31st March 1967 issued to M/s. Amortex Agencies Private Ltd., Flat No. 52, Warden Court, Gowalia Tank Road, 5th Floor, Bombay-26, is hereby cancelled.

3. A duplicate Customs Purposes copy of the said licence is being issued to the licensee separately.

M/s. Amortex Agencies Private Ltd.,  
Flat No. 52, Warden Court,  
Gowalia Tank Road, 5th Floor,  
Bombay-26.

[No. NDRS/A574/65-66/4148.]

Y. J. DENNISON,  
Dy. Chief Controller

**MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION****(Department of Agriculture)***New Delhi, the 13th March 1968*

**S.O. 1023.**—In pursuance of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2), of section 15 of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 (59 of 1960), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Department of Agriculture) No. S.O. 3398, dated the 26th September, 1964, the Central Government, on the advice of the Animal Welfare Board, hereby constitutes a Committee for Controlling and Supervising Experiments on Animals consisting of the following persons as members, and nominates Shri Kumalnayan Bajaj, as Chairman of the said Committee, namely:—

1. The Director, Central Research Institute, Kasauli.
2. The Director, Haffkini Institute, Bombay.
3. The Director, The Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar.
4. The Deputy Director, General of Health Services, Directorate-General of Health Services, New Delhi.
5. Dr. (Mrs.) B. K. Batra, Officer-in-charge, Laboratory Animals, Information Service and Head of Embryology Section of the Biology Division, Tata Memorial Centre, Parel, Bombay.
6. Dr. A. B. Kar, Scientist 'F', Central Drug Research Institute, Lucknow.
7. Dr. L. N. Mohapatra, Associate Professor of Microbiology, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi.

8. Dr. E. R. B. Shamnugasundaram, Professor, Department of Biochemistry, University of Madras, Madras.
9. Shri B. K. Aikat, Director-Professor, Pathology, Post-graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research, Chandigarh.
10. Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj, Member, Lok Sabha.
11. Shrimati Rukmani Devi Arundale, Chairman, Animal Welfare Board, Gandhinagar, Madras.
12. Shri G. R. Rajagopaul, Vice Chairman, Animal Welfare Board, C.53, South Extension--Part I, New Delhi.
13. Shri J. N. Mankar, Honorary Secretary, Bombay Humanitarian League, 149, Shroff Bazar, Bombay.
14. Shri V. N. Dwivedi, Director, Institute of Ayurvedic Studies and Research, Jamnagar.

[No. 19-2/67-L.D.III.]

SANTOKH SINGH, Under Secy.

(Department of Agriculture)

New Delhi the 18th March 1968


**S.O. 1024.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Agricultural Produce (Grading and Marking) Act, 1937 (1 of 1937), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Pulses Grading and Marking Rules, 1964, the same having been previously published as required by the said section, namely:—

1. These rules may be called the Pulses Grading and Marking (Amendment) Rules, 1968.

2. In the Pulses Grading and Marking Rules, 1964,

(i) for rule 5, the following rule shall be substituted, namely:—

"5. *Grade Designation Mark.*—(1) The grade designation mark in the case of  $\frac{1}{2}$  kg. and 1 kg. packings of pulses (whole or split) packed in polythene or paper bags, shall consist of a design incorporating the number of the certificate of authorisation, the word 'Agmark' and the grade of the pulses (whole or split) as approved by the Agricultural Marketing Adviser.

(2) The grade designation mark in the case of pulses (whole or split) packed in containers of jute or cloth as also in containers in which sealed polythene bags of graded pulses (whole or split) are packed shall consist of a label specifying the grade designation and bearing a design (consisting of an outline map of India with the word 'Agmark' and the figure of the rising sun with the words 'Produce of India' and  resembling the one as set out in Schedule I."

(ii) in rule 6,

(1) in sub-rule (1), for the words "affixed to each container", the words "affixed to or printed on each container" shall be substituted;

(2) for sub-rule (2), the following sub-rule shall be substituted, namely:—

"(2) In addition to the grade designation mark, the following particulars shall also be clearly and indelibly marked on each container, namely:—

- (a) date of packing in code or plain letters,
- (b) lot number, and
- (c) net weight."

(3) in sub-rule (3), for the words "affixed to the container", the words "affixed to or printed on the container" shall be substituted.

(iii) In Schedules II, IV, V and VI, under the column "General Characteristics", for item (c) and the entry relating thereto, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

“(c) be sweet, clean, wholesome and free from moulds, weevils, obnoxious smell, discolouration, admixture of deleterious substances (including added colouring matter) and all other impurities except to the extent indicated in the Schedule;”.

[No. 13-1/67-AM.]

**S.O. 1025.**—The following draft of rules further to amend the Onions Grading and Marking Rules, 1964, which the Central Government proposes to make, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Agricultural Produce (Grading and Marking) Act, 1937 (1 of 1937) are published, as required by the said section for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after 20th April, 1968.

Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the date specified will be considered by the Central Government.

#### Draft Rules

1. These rules may be called the Onions Grading and Marking (Amendment) Rules, 1968.

2. In the Onions Grading and Marking Rules, 1964, for Schedule II, the following Schedule shall be substituted, namely:—

#### SCHEDULE II

(See rule 3 and 4)

“Grade designation and definition of quality of Nasik/Saurashtra/Bellary Onions (*Allium cepa*, L)

Grade Designation	Special Characteristics		General Characteristics
	Size (Diameter) mm (Min.)	Colour	
1	2	3	4
Extra Big	55	Light to Rosy	The Bulbs shall—
Big A	45	Do.	1. be reasonably uniform in shape, colour and pungency characteristics of the variety/type;
Big B	45	Do.	2. be mature, solid in feel, reasonably firm with tough clinging skins free from doublets and bottle necks.
Medium A	35	Do.	3. be thoroughly canned and dried.
B**	35	Do.	4. be free from damage caused by seed-stem, cobs, roots, moisture, dry sun-scold, sun-burn, sprouting and mechanical or other injuries and staining dirt or other foreign material and
Small A	20	Do.	5. be free from moulds, diseases, rot, decay and insect attack
B**	20	Do.	
Mixed A***	Different sizes of a variety not below 20 mm.	Do.	
B**	Do.		

NOTE.— 1. Tolerance for size . . . . . For accidental errors in sizing, not more than 5% by weight of the bulbs in any lot may be of the next lower grade than the minimum diameter prescribed.

2. Tolerance for requirements in respect of general Characteristics. . . . . To allow for variations other than size incident to proper grading and handling not more than 10% by weight of the onions may fail to meet the requirements of the grade.

3. Mixed\*\*\* . . . . . This grade may be packed against a ‘Firm Order’ only.

B\*\* The grade B shall apply to onions commercially known as phol onions and grown in Nasik district. The percentage of seed stem onions shall not exceed 20% besides the usual tolerance indicated in footnote 2”.

[No. 13-29/67-AM.]

V. S. NIGAM, Under Secy.



**MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION**

(Department of Labour and Employment)

*New Delhi, the 8th March 1968*

**S.O. 1026.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Model Jharla Colliery, Post Office Jharla (Dhanbad) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 2nd March, 1968.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT DHANBAD**

In the matter of a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

REFERENCE NO. 51 OF 1967

**PARTIES :**

Employers in relation to the Model Jharla Colliery, P.O. Jharla, (Dhanbad).  
Vs.

Their Workmen.

**PRESENT :**

Shri Kamla Sahai,—Presiding Officer

**APPEARANCES :**

*For the Employers :—None.*

*For the Workmen :—Shri B. K. Lath, Advocate.*

**STATE :** Bihar

**INDUSTRY :** Coal.

*Dhanbad, dated the 20th February, 1968*

**AWARD**

Being of opinion that an industrial dispute exists the Central Government has, by its order No. 2/114/87-LR/II, dated the 9th November, 1967 made this reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, the schedule attached to the reference being as follows:—

**SCHEDULE**

"Whether the management of Model Jharla Colliery was justified in terminating the services of Shri Lachhu Nonia, Miner with effect from the 17th March, 1967? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. Notices were served upon both parties and the workman filed his statement before this Tribunal on the 27th December, 1967. No one appeared on the 15th January, 1968, which was the next date fixed, but I directed notice to issue to both parties once again, fixing the 5th February, 1968 for hearing. The workman alone appeared on the 5th February. The employers in relation to Model Jharla Colliery, the company in question, did not appear. In order to give the company a last chance, I directed issue of another notice to the company, fixing today for hearing. The workman has appeared through Mr. Lath, an Advocate, today. The company has remained absent. The case is, therefore, taken up *ex-parte*.

3. It seems that chargesheet dated the 8th March, 1967 was served upon the workman, making the allegation that he quarreled with and assaulted his co-workers, working underground. He was suspended with effect from the 9th March. The chargesheet was actually served upon him on the 11th March and he submitted his explanation, denying the charge made against him. He was not served with any notice to the effect that an enquiry would be held. There is no evidence at all to show that an enquiry was actually held. Indeed, the employers have not even filed a written statement in which an allegation could be made that an enquiry was held. By a letter dated the 17th March, 1967 issued under the signature of the Manager, Model Jharla Colliery, the workman, Lachhu Nonia, was informed that his employment had been terminated with immediate effect from that very day i.e. the 17th March, 1967.

4. It is manifest from what I have stated above that the services of the workman in question have been terminated without any domestic enquiry or a finding against him by an enquiry officer. There has been no determination of the question of the

petitioner's guilt. This is quite obviously contrary to the principles of natural justice. Such a dismissal must be held to be quite unjustified.

5. In the result, I hold that the act of the management of Model Jharia Colliery in terminating the service of Shri Lachhu Nonia, Miner, was not justified. Hence, Shri Nonia is entitled to be reinstated with full back wages and continuity of service. This is my award. Let it be submitted to the Central Government under section 15 of the Act.

Sd./- KAMLA SAHAI,  
Presiding Officer.  
[No. 2/114/67-LRII.]

New Delhi, the 11th March 1968

**S.O. 1027.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the 6 & 7 Pits Jamadoba Colliery of Messrs Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited, Post Office Jealgora, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 5th March, 1968.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL—CUM—  
LABOUR COURT AT DHANBAD**

In the matter of a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

REFERENCE NO. 54 OF 1967

**PARTIES:**

Employers in relation to the 6 & 7 Pits Jamadoba Colliery of Messrs Tata Iron & Steel Co Ltd P.O. Jealgora, Dist. Dhanbad.

Vrs.

Their Workmen

**PRESENT:**

Shri Kamla Sahai -Presiding Officer

**APPEARANCES:**

For the Employers.—Shri L. H. Parvatiyar, Legal Assistant.

For the Workmen.—Shri Anil Sarkar, Secretary, Tata Collieries Workers' Union, Digwadih

STATE: Bihar.

INDUSTRY: Coal.

Dhanbad, dated the 20th February, 1968

**AWARD**

Having formed the opinion that an industrial dispute exists, the Central Government has made this reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act—vide the Ministry's order No 2/70/67-LRII dated the 14th November, 1967, with the following schedule:—

**SCHEDULE**

“Whether the action of the management of 6 & 7 Pits Jamadoba Colliery of Messrs Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited, Post Office Jealgora, (Dhanbad) in dismissing Shri Tripura Banerjee, Clerk Grade III, from service with effect from the 10th December, 1966, was an act of victimisation? If so, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

2. I may shortly mention the facts. The system which is said to be followed in 6 & 7 Pits of Jamadoba Colliery of Tata Iron and Steel Company is that bills are prepared in favour of different payees and their names and other details are listed in one or more sheets. A clerk is deputed to be the paymaster for a particular day. It is his duty to take from the cashier the total amount as shown in the sheet or sheets prepared for the particular day for which he is deputed as the paymaster. He goes on making payments to those whose names are to be found in the list and taking their signatures or thumb impressions, as the case may be, against their names. He has to do all these in the presence of another clerk who is called a witness. The witness has to sign his name at the end after disbursement of the entire list under a stamped endorsement which reads “I

hereby certify that I witnessed the payment of the wages and that payment has been made to the correct parties". He has then put the date under his signature.

3. After the total disbursement has been made for the day, the paymaster has to stamp the word "unpaid" against different amounts which remain unpaid, striking the total of the amount paid. The witness has nothing to do with the amount remaining unpaid but the paymaster has to show in his account the total of the unpaid balance. He has then to refund the unpaid balance to the cashier.

4. On the 13th August, 1966, Shri S. M. Missir, a clerk in Grade II was the paymaster and Shri Tripura Banerjee, a clerk in Grade III, was the witness in respect of payments to be made relating to 6 & 7 Pits of the Colliery. The total amount put in the hands of the paymaster was Rs. 502.89 Paise. As shown by him in the stamped account, a total of Rs. 72.36 Paise remained unpaid while a sum of Rs. 430.53 paise was paid to different workmen including one Sibū Bid. It transpired later that the amount said to have been paid to Sibū Bid might have been paid to a wrong person but it was not paid to him. Chargesheets No. 146 dated 31st August 1966 and No. 154 dated 5th September 1966 were, therefore, issued respectively to Shri S. M. Missir and Sri Tripura Banerjee. Enquiry into the two chargesheets was entrusted to Sri D. R. Mody, MW1, who has been working as Welfare Officer (Personnel) of the Tata Iron & Steel Co. I am not concerned at present with the case of Shri S. M. Missir. After examining the witnesses and looking into the papers on the 15th September, 1966, Sri Mody drew up his report (Ext. M14) on the 19th September, 1966. In this report, his conclusion regarding Tripura Banerjee was that he did not at all see Sibū Bid and was quite certain that there was foul play after payment had been completed and he had gone home. He recommended that the chargesheet issued against him should be filed.

5. The management has not produced any paper to show that the Manager's reaction on the enquiry report was although the union insisted upon the production of a letter said to have been written by the Manager to the Chief Mining Engineer. Even on the date of hearing, Shri Parvatiyar, the legal Assistant of the company, filed a petition, stating that the alleged letter was neither traceable in the Manager's office nor in the Chief Mining Engineer's office. The union, however, filed a photostat copy of such a letter addressed by the Manager to the Asstt. Chief Mining Engineer, dated the 20th September, 1966. In this letter, the Manager purports to have said that he was in full concurrence with the findings of the enquiring officer that the foul play was committed by Shri Missir alone without collaboration of and in the absence of Shri Tripura Banerjee after the payment was over.

6. Ext. M-8 is a letter addressed by the Asstt. Chief Mining Engineer, Jamadoba Group, to the Enquiring Officer, Shri Mody. The substantial part of this letter is in paragraph 2 which reads "Shri Tripura Banerjee in his statement has not stated clearly as to what were his specific duties and responsibilities as a witness to the payment. According to our procedure the witness has to certify on the paysheets as "I hereby certify that I witnessed the payment of the wages and that payment has been made to the correct parties". But from the enquiry report it is not clear whether this particular paysheet bore the certificate from Shri Tripura Banerjee or not.

The Enquiry Officer, was, therefore, advised to make another enquiry and get the points mentioned in the letter clarified by checking the records and by confronting Shri Tripura Banerjee with it.

7. After receiving Ex. M-8, Shri Mody further examined Shri Tripura Banerjee on the 16th October, 1966. Shri Banerjee then said that he had given a certificate of the kind which is required of a witness but it is significant that the Enquiry Officer did not show him the stamped endorsement or the signature which he purports to have made on the list prepared on the 13th August, 1966.

8. However, the Enquiry Officer concluded the enquiry after examining Tripura Banerjee and submitted a supplementary report dated 26th October 1966, in which he found Tripura Banerjee guilty.

9. By a letter dated the 5th December, 1966, Shri H. Neogy, the Asstt. Chief Mining Engineer and Agent, Jamadoba Group conveyed to Shri Tripura Banerjee information that he was being dismissed with effect from the 10th December, 1966.

10. The question which I have to consider is whether the management's act in dismissing Tripura Banerjee is an act of victimisation. The 1st point which may be noted in this connection is that Shri Tripura Banerjee is a member of the Tata Collieries Workers Union which is not recognised by the management. Shri Anil Sarkar, the Secretary of that union, appeared before me, on behalf of the union. Shri Tripura Banerjee has examined himself and he has stated that he is not only a member of the Tata Collieries Workers Union but he was its Secretary for 6 & 7 Pits in 1964. He has further said that he goes to the management sometimes with cases of workmen but they do not listen to him and that he was chargesheeted because of his activities in favour of that union. Shri Parvatlyar has taken from him in cross-examination that he gets prizes for preparing posters and paintings. I do not think that that is a matter of importance. As he obviously has some skill in preparing posters, he may be getting prizes. It seems to me that the management must be annoyed with him because of his activities on behalf of an unrecognised union.

11. The second point to be noted is that the enquiring officer found him not guilty and the Manager concurred with the enquiring officer. I am not prepared to say that the Asstt. Chief Mining Engineer could not interfere but I am definitely of the view that he should have looked into connected records before interfering. Once he passed an order for the enquiring officer to make a further enquiry, it must have been construed by the enquiring officer to be a broad hint to him to find the alleged delinquent to be guilty. There are two very important points which the Asstt. Chief Mining Engineer should have looked into. The 1st point is that the whole system of getting a witness to put his signature under a certificate of the kind for which the stamp has been prepared is wrong. The number of names in the list prepared on the 13th August, 1966 was 38. Payments were made to persons whose names appeared on one page or the other in accordance with the order in which they came. After the paymaster made a total of all these payments and put it down at the back of the list, it would be impossible for the supposed witness to say that payment had actually been made to all those who purported to have been paid. MW-2 is the cashier. He has said that it is the paymaster who draws up an unpaid list and that the witness does not sign that list. This shows that the unpaid list must be prepared in the absence of the witness and Shri Parvatlyar has taken it from MW-2 that the unpaid list is prepared in the case of any kind of payment, including payment of sick allowances. I do not think that the witness could certify as to which of the payees was actually paid unless the unpaid stamps were put in his presence and the unpaid list was prepared in his presence. This system could only work as a sure method if the witness was required to witness each payment as and when it was made...

12. The other point which the Asstt. Chief Mining Engineer and also the enquiring officer appears to have missed is that no stamp of the kind mentioned by the Asstt. Chief Mining Engineer or by the cashier, MW-2 has been put on the list Ext. M-11 prepared on the 13th August, 1966. There is a stamp which is mostly indecipherable and which has been signed by Shri Misra, the paymaster. Shri Tripura Banerjee has just put down his signature below that stamp. It is difficult to bind him to any statement contained in a stamped certificate when it is quite illegible.

13. I may add that the chargesheet says that Shri Tripura Banerjee has made himself liable to disciplinary action under clause 19(2) of the standing orders. The standing orders or an extract of the standing orders has not been produced. I have, therefore, no idea what act of Tripura Banerjee is said to constitute the misconduct. He is not alleged to have made any payment to anybody. It is not said that he collaborated with Shri Misra in making wrong payment and there is no evidence to that effect. He has frankly said that he did not see Siby Bid on the 13th August and, if Siby Bid had come that day, he would have filled up his Bonus Card which he did not do. In all these circumstances, I am unable to find what misconduct he can be held to have committed.

14. I have no doubt at all in my mind that the enquiring officer found Tripura Banerjee guilty simply because he was told by the Asstt. Chief Mining Engineer to make a further enquiry. He must have thought that that Engineer desired him to find Tripura Banerjee guilty. This amounts clearly to victimisation. The fact that the management did not produce a copy of the manager's letter addressed to the Chief Mining Engineer appears also to have been motivated by the idea that the punishment dealt with should stand, rightly or wrongly. I have therefore, no alternative but to hold that there has been victimisation in this case. Shri

Banerjee is entitled to be reinstated with effect from the 10th December, 1966 with full back wages and continuity of service.

15. The above decision is my award. Let it be submitted to the Central Government under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Sd/-) KAMLA SAHAI,  
Presiding Officer,

[No. 2/70/67-LRII.]

**S.O. 1028.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal (No. 2) Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the New Sindih Colliery of Messrs Bamandiha Coal Company Limited, Post Office Katrasgarh, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 6th March, 1968.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2)  
AT DHANBAD**

In the matter of a reference under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

REFERENCE No. 109 OF 1967

**PARTIES:**

Employers in relation to the New Sindih Colliery of Messrs Bamandiha Coal Company Limited, Post Office Katrasgarh, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their workmen.

**PRESENT:**

Sri Nandagiri Venkata Rao, Presiding Officer.

**APPEARANCES:**

*For the employers.*—Sri M. K. Sinha, Supervisor.

*For the workmen.*—Sri Shanker Bose, Secretary, Colliery Mazdoor Sangh.

**STATE:** Bihar.

**INDUSTRY:** Coal.

*Dhanbad, dated the 29th February, 1968*

**AWARD**

The Central Government, being of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the New Sindih Colliery of Messrs Bamandiha Coal Company Limited, Post Office Katrasgarh, District Dhanbad, and their workmen by its order No. 2/146/65-LRII dated 22nd February 1966 referred to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication the dispute in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule annexed thereto. The Schedule is extracted below:—

**SCHEDULE**

- "I. Whether the action of the management of the New Sindih Colliery of Messrs Bamandiha Coal Company Limited was justified in suspending Sri D. P. Mitra, Register-Keeper, with effect from the 18th August, 1965 and in subsequently dismissing him from service with effect from the 18th October, 1965. If not, to what relief is he entitled?
- II. Whether the action of the management of New Sindih Colliery of Messrs Bamandiha Coal Company Limited was justified in stopping Sri Fagu Rewani, Mining Sirdar, from work with effect from 6th August, 1965 and refusing to provide employment thereafter? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?
- III. Whether the action of the management of New Sindih Colliery of Messrs Bamandiha Coal Company Limited in refusing work to S/Sri Butan Bouri and Janki Dussad, Boiler Attendants, with effect from the 23rd August, 1965 and 1st September, 1965, respectively, was justified? If not, to what relief are the said workmen entitled?"

2. The Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad registered the reference as reference No 30 of 1966 on its file. The workmen filed their statement of demands. While it was pending before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad the proceeding was transferred to this Tribunal, by the Central Government by its order No 8/25/67-LRII dated 8th May 1967 under Section 33B(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Consequently, the reference is re-numbered on the file of this Tribunal as reference No 109 of 1967.

3 On 26th February 1968 when the reference was taken up for hearing evidence and arguments, the workmen were represented by Sri Shanker Bose, Secretary, Colliery Mazdoor Sangh and the employers by Sri M. K. Sinha, Supervisor. Both parties filed a compromise memo and it was duly verified. The terms of compromise are as follows:—

- “(a) It is agreed that in item No (1) of the schedule, Shri D. P. Mitra, Register-Keeper will be treated as if retrenched with effect from 18th October, 1965
- (b) It is agreed that in item No (II) of the schedule, Sri Fagu Rewani, Mining Sirdar will be treated as if retrenched with effect from 6th August, 1965.
- (c) It is agreed that in item No. (III) of the schedule, S/Shri Butan Bouri and Janki Dussad, Boiler Attendants will be treated as if retrenched with effect from 23rd August, 1965 and 1st September, 1965 respectively.
- (d) That all the workmen in (a), (b) and (c) above will be paid compensation in terms of section 25F(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947).
- (e) That the said payment will be made within 30 days from the date of the Award becoming effective
- (f) That the parties will bear their respective costs of this proceedings”

4. I consider the terms as favourable to the affected workmen and also to the workmen. The compromise is, therefore, accepted and the award is made accordingly and submitted under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

(Sd.) N. VENKATA RAO,  
Presiding Officer.

#### APPENDIX I

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO 2) AT DHANBAD

#### REFERENCE NO. 109 OF 1967

Employers in relation to the New Sinidih Colliery of Messrs Bamandiha Coal Company Limited  
Post Office Katragarh, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their workmen.

#### *List of Documents Admitted in Evidence for the Employers*

Distinguishing mark or number	Description of document and date	Date of admission	Whether admitted after or without objection	Remarks
NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL

*List of Documents Admitted in evidence for the Workmen*

Sl. No. or number	Description of document and date	Date of admission	Whether admitted after or without objection	Remarks
NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL

(Sd.) N. VENKATA RAO,  
Presiding Officer.

APPENDIX II

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

REFERENCE NO. 109 OF 1967

Employers in relation to the New Sindih Colliery of Messrs Bamandih Coal Company Limited,  
Post Office Katrasgarh, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their workmen.

*List of Witnesses examined for the Employers*

No. of witness	Name of witness	Date of examination
NIL	NIL	NIL

*List of Witnesses Examined for the Workmen*

No. of witness	Name of witness	Date of examination
NIL	NIL	NIL

(Sd.) N. VENKATA RAO,  
Presiding Officer.

[No. 2/146/65-LRII.]

New Delhi, the 12th March 1968

**S.O. 1029.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Ramgarh Jharria Colliery, Post Office Karmatand via Mohuda, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 5th March, 1968.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-  
LABOUR COURT AT DHANBAD**

In the matter of a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

REFERENCE No. 56 OF 1967

**PARTIES:**

Employers in relation to the Ramgarh Jharlia Colliery, Post Office Karmatand via Mohuda, District Dhanbad.

**AND**

Their Workmen.

**PRESENT:**

Shri Kamla Sahai, Presiding Officer.

**APPEARANCES:**

For the Employers.—Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate.

For the Workmen.—Shri B. K. Lath, Advocate.

STATE: Bihar.

INDUSTRY: Coal.

*Dhanbad, dated the 15th February, 1968*

**AWARD**

Having formed the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the parties, the Central Government has, by its order No. 2/131/67-LRII, dated the 18th November, 1967 referred the following question for adjudication to this Tribunal:—

**SCHEDULE**

“(i) Whether the dismissal of Shri Karma Mahato, Pump Khalasis, with effect from the 24th August, 1967, by the management of Ramgarh Jharlia Colliery, Post Office Karmatand via Mohuda, District Dhanbad was justified?

(ii) If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

2. The facts of the case may be shortly stated. The concerned workman, Shri Karma Mahato, has been working as a pump khalasis in the Ramgarh Jharlia Colliery for several years. He felt feverish on the 5th April, 1967. On the 6th April, he appeared in the colliery office and was examined by the colliery doctor in the presence of the Manager, Shri S. R. Chatterjee. The employers' case is that Doctor Lahiri, the colliery Doctor, found Karma Mahato suffering from fever and gave him two days' medicine, asking him to report again on the 8th April. The workman's case is that he asked the Manager to request the doctor to attend him at his house because he felt ill but the Manager told him that the doctor could only attend him when he came to the colliery.

3. It is the admitted case of both parties that Karma Mahato did not appear in the colliery on the 8th April and, in fact, he did not report for duty until the 3rd May, 1967. The employers' case is that he remained absent for the entire period from the 8th April to the 2nd May without leave and without permission. The workman's case, on the other hand, is that he remained ill for the whole period. As the colliery doctor, Doctor Lahiri, could not attend to him at his house, he called Doctor A. K. Mukherjee of Bokaro Jharlia Colliery to treat him medically and remained under his treatment from the 7th April to the 22nd April, 1967. Thereafter, that Doctor advised him to take rest for 10 days from the 22nd April. He examined the workman again on the 2nd May and found him fit to resume duty. Hence, he resumed his duties from the 3rd May.

4. The Manager, Shri S. R. Chatterjee, issued a chargesheet (Ext. M1) dated the 30th April, 1967 against Karma Mahato, asking him to show cause why appropriate action should not be taken against him for having been absent from the duty without duly approved leave with effect from the 8th April, 1967. He, however, allowed the workman to join his duties when he reported for work on the 3rd May. In the show cause petition which he filed on the 5th May, Karma Mahato stated that he was examined by the colliery doctor in the Manager's presence on the 6th April and he gave him some medicines, that he (Karma Mahato) requested the Manager to direct the colliery doctor to attend him at



his house during his illness because of his high temperature but the management did not entertain the request and told Karma Mahato that he must come to the colliery in order to enable the colliery doctor to treat him. He further said in the same petition that he called in another doctor on the 7th April, 1967 and that the other doctor treated and cured him. He also attached Doctor Mukherjee's certificate dated the 2nd May, 1967 to his petition in original. The certificate supported his case as to the course of his illness. The show cause petition is Ext. M2 and the certificate is Ext. M2(a).

5. By a letter dated the 17th May, 1967 (Ext. M3) the Manager informed Karma Mahato that a departmental enquiry will be held into the charge-sheet dated the 30th April, 1967 issued to him on the 21st May, 1967 and that he (the workman) should attend the enquiry with his witness, if any. Karma Mahato sent a letter Ext. M4 dated the 20th May, 1967 in reply to the Manager's letter. In this letter, he said that there was no question of enquiry when he had attached a medical certificate in support of his facts but, if the Manager insisted upon holding an enquiry, it should be held after Shri Awdesh Kumar Singh, the Secretary of his union, returned from leave. By a letter (Ext. M5) dated the 21st May, 1967, the Manager informed the workman that the enquiry had been adjourned to the 28th May, 1967. Ext. M6 is the workman's reply in which he stated that he could get the enquiry made on the 28th May if the union Secretary, Shri Awdesh Kumar Singh, came back from leave by that date but, if he did not, he would pray for further adjournment.

6. By a further letter (Ext. M7) dated the 15th June, 1967, the Manager informed Karma Mahato that the enquiry had been adjourned to the 25th June. Ext. M8 dated the 21st June, 1967 is the workman's reply. He has stated therein that Awdesh Kumar Singh was present in the colliery office from the 31st May upto the 12th June, 1967 but the enquiry was not fixed on any date during that period. It had been fixed now that Awdesh Kumar Singh had gone. He wanted to know whether Awdesh Kumar Singh would be allowed to participate in the enquiry, and, if he would be so allowed, he prayed for 10 (ten) days time so that he might get the Secretary ready for participation in the enquiry. Ext. M9 is a letter dated the 30th June, 1967. It is a rather long letter written by the Manager to Karma Mahato. Among other facts, it has been stated in it that Awdesh Kumar Singh reported for duty on the 31st May, 1967 and resigned his service on the 10th June, 1967. It was not known to the management that he would resign and therefore the enquiry could not be fixed before the date of his resignation. He had been allowed to participate in the enquiry because he was in the colliery service but, now that he had gone out of it, he could not be allowed to participate in the enquiry. Karma Mahato, however, could take the assistance of any other of his co-workers to help him in the enquiry. After giving other details the enquiry was fixed on the 9th July. In his letter (Ext. M10), dated the 7th June, Karma Mahato stated that he was getting apprehensive because an ordinary matter was being made much of and he felt that all efforts were directed towards keeping Awdesh Kumar Singh out of the enquiry though he thought that Awdesh Kumar Singh would be the proper legal adviser for him in the enquiry. On the basis of this fact, he prayed for a further adjournment. Ext. M11 dated the 31st July is another letter by the management to the workman. It has been stated in this letter that Shri Awdesh Kumar Singh could not legally be permitted to be even present during the departmental enquiry—not to speak of his participation in the enquiry. The enquiry was being finally posted for the 6th August, Ext. M12 dated the 3rd August 1967 is Karma Mahato's reply to this letter. He has stated therein that he wanted Shri Awdesh Kumar Singh to act as his representative. He could not have confidence in the enquiry until he had a representative of his choice. Besides, Awdesh Kumar Singh was present in the office at the time of the incident and, therefore, he (Karma Mahato) wanted to examine him as a witness also. The name of the enquiry officer had also not been disclosed. Unless the man selected to make the enquiry is one in whom he had confidence, the enquiry could not be satisfactory. On these grounds, he prayed for further adjournment in this case.

7. It appears that the Manager did not send any further reply and the enquiry was held on the 6th August, 1967 by Shri B. P. Sinha, MW1, an employee of a different concern. He says that he held the enquiry at the instance of the proprietor of Ramgar Jharla Colliery, Shri Kantilal Parkhani. He recorded the statements of the Manager, Shri S. R. Chatterjee and that of Dr. S. N. Lahiri. The enquiry was *ex-parte* because Karma Mahato did not appear. On the same date the enquiry officer prepared his report Ext. (M13). Ext. M15 is a letter dated the

24th August, 1967 whereby Karma Mahato was informed that he had been dismissed from service with immediate effect.

8. Documents marked Ext. M 1 to M 15 have been filed on behalf of the management and documents Ext. W 1 to W 7 have been filed on behalf of the workman at the hearing in this case. The enquiring officer, Shri B. P. Sinha, has alone been examined as MW 1 on behalf of the management. Karma Mahato has been examined as WW 1 and Awdesh Kumar Singh, Branch Secretary of the Ashakuty Phularitand Labour Union, WW 2 has been examined on behalf of the workman.

9. In view of the arguments of the parties, the following points may be formulated for consideration in this case:

- (i) Have the rules of natural justice been followed at the domestic enquiry?
- (ii) Has there been victimisation and unfair labour practice in the matter of dismissal of Karma Mahato?
- (iii) Is the concerned workman entitled to any relief?

*Point (i)*

10. The most serious grievance which Shri B. K. Lath, Advocate, who has appeared on behalf of the concerned workman has raised is that the management did not disclose to Karma Mahato the name of Shri B. P. Sinha as the man who had been deputed to make the enquiry. Shri B. P. Sinha himself said that he gave no notice to the workman that he was the enquiry officer. No other evidence has been adduced to show that any such notice was given to him. It must, therefore, be treated as admitted that the name of the enquiring officer was not disclosed to Karma Mahato before the enquiry proceedings. Shri Lath has referred me to the case of Sur Enamel and Stamping Works, Ltd., and Their workmen reported in 1963 (II) L. L. J. 367. In that case, Das Gupta J., who has delivered the judgement of the Supreme Court, has observed that it is not sufficient that the management should only go through a form of enquiry. That would not satisfy the requirements of the industrial law. He has given certain circumstances which must be present before an enquiry can be said to have been properly held. Two of these circumstances are (1) that the workman concerned is given a fair opportunity to examine witnesses including himself in his defence if he so wishes and (2) that the enquiring officer records his findings with reasons for the same in his report. There is nothing in that decision to show that the name of the enquiring officer should be disclosed to the alleged delinquent before the enquiry. I am therefore unable to hold that any rule of natural justice can be said to have been violated on the ground of non-disclosure of the enquiring officer's name.

11. Shri S. S. Mukherjee, who has appeared on behalf of the employers, has urged that a workman is not entitled to be represented at an enquiry against him by a union official of his own choice. In support of this argument, he has relied upon a decision of the Supreme Court in Brooke Bond India (Private) Ltd., Vs. Subba Raman (S) and another, reported in 1961 (II) L. L. J. 417 and a decision of the Patna High Court in Harinagar Sugar Mills, Ltd., Vs. Siv Saran Sinha and another, reported in 1961 (II) L. L. J. 511. In the former decision, Their Lordships have quoted the observation of the same Court in Kalindi and others Vs. Tata Locomotive and Engineering Company Ltd., [1960 (II) L. L. J. 228] as follows:—

“A workman against whom an enquiry is being held by the management, has no right to be represented at such enquiry by a representative of his union, though the employer, in his discretion, can and may allow him to be so represented... and it cannot be said that in any enquiry against a workman natural justice demands that he should be represented by a representative of his union”.

12. In view of the above principles, it cannot be said that Karma Mahato was entitled to insist upon his representation at the enquiry by Awdesh Kumar Singh as a union official. I may, however, observe that according to the evidence of Awdesh Kumar Singh, he was in the service of the colliery from before. He proceeded on leave with effect from the 17th May, 1967 and returned from leave on the 31st May. He submitted his letter of resignation on the 10th June, 1967 and left the colliery after full and final settlement on the 13th June, 1967. It is remarkable that the enquiry was being postponed before-hand for very short period. It was first fixed for the 21st May, and then on the 28th May but, when Awdesh Kumar Singh returned from leave on the 31st May, the enquiry was not held on any date between the 1st and the 12th June. This appears to me to show a clear

attempt, as asserted later by the concerned workman himself, on the part of the management to avoid participation of Awdesh Kumar Singh in the enquiry as desired by the workman. After Awdesh Kumar Singh left the colliery, the management naturally got a good excuse to keep him out and to prevent the workman from being represented by him.

13. Besides, the workman has clearly stated in his letter Ext. M12 dated the 3rd August, 1967 that he wished to examine Awdesh Kumar Singh as his witness also. The management should then have told him that, if he desired, he could produce Awdesh Kumar Singh as a defence witness but not as a representative. This they did not do. The impression of Karma Mahato must therefore have been that he could not produce Awdesh Kumar Singh either as a representative or as a defence witness. He is hardly a literate man and, in my opinion, the enquiry against him has not been fair or in consonance with natural justice because he was not given intimation of the fact that he could produce Awdesh Kumar Singh as a defence witness.

14. The enquiring officer has also not been very clear about his duty. The most important question which he had to decide was whether the medical certificate filed by Karma Mahato was correct and whether he remained absent from his duties on account of illness. Doctor A. K. Mukherjee, who gave the certificate to Karma Mahato, appears to have been the colliery doctor of a neighbouring colliery namely Bokaro Jharia Colliery, P.O. Karmatand i.e. the same post office as that of Ramgar Jharia Colliery. If the management had desired to be fair, they could easily have ascertained by an enquiry from that doctor whether the certificate given by him to Karma Mahato was correct. The management did not do so. As the enquiry was being held *ex-parte*, the enquiry officer should at least have made an enquiry from the doctor, even by post, whether his certificate was correct. He has not even considered in his report that the certificate granted by Doctor Mukherjee might be correct.

15. In the circumstances mentioned above, I hold that the enquiry was not held in accordance with natural justice in this case.

#### Point (ii)

16. Awdesh Kumar Singh. WW2 has stated that the attitude of the management has been very bad towards members of his union and that almost all those who became members have been victimised. He has further said that Karma Mahato became a member of his union in 1966. He has further given out that Karma Mahato and others filed complaints Ext. W5 and W6 before the colliery manager. Karma Mahato, WW1, has also stated that Exts. W5, W6 and W7 were sent by him under registered covers, one of them being on behalf of his union. Thereafter, the management started threatening him with dire consequences. I believe the evidence of these two witnesses on these points and, in any case, there is no evidence to the contrary. The fact that Karma Mahato was found even by the colliery doctor ill on the 6th May lends support to his case that he was down with enteric fever with effect from the 7th May. The fact that the management made no enquiry from the doctor whose certificate he filed before instituting a departmental enquiry shows that the attitude of the management was rather adverse to him. The manner in which Awdesh Kumar Singh was excluded from participation in the enquiry also gives an indication to the same effect. The extreme punishment of dismissal was meted out to him, for a mere absence of a few days, which might be due to illness. This also leads to the same conclusion. In view of these circumstances, I hold that there has been victimisation and unfair labour practice in this case.

#### Point (iii)

17. On the basis of the findings which I given above, I hold that the dismissal of Shri Karma Mahato, Pump/Khalasi, with effect from the 24th August, 1967 by the management of Ramgar Jharia Colliery was not justified. Karma Mahato is, therefore entitled to be reinstated with full back wages and continuity of service from the date of his dismissal. This is my award. Let it be submitted to the Central Government under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

(Sd/-) KAMLA SAHAI,  
Presiding Officer.

[No. 2/131/67-LRIL]

New Delhi, the 14th March 1968

**S.O. 1030.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Pure Dhansar Colliery, Post Office Dhansar, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 11th March, 1968.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR**

*Dated February 29, 1968*

**PRESENT:**

Sri G. C. Agarwala—*Presiding Officer.*

CASE REF. NO. CGIT/LC(R)(71)/67 (JABALPUR TRIBUNAL)

CASE REFERENCE NO. 2 OF 1965 (DHANBAD TRIBUNAL)

**PARTIES:**

Employers in relation to Pure Dhansar Colliery, P.O. Dhansar, District Dhanbad (Bihar).

*Vs.*

Their workmen represented through Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, P.O. and District Dhanbad (Bihar).

**APPEARANCES:**

*For employers*—S/Sri Shiv Kumar Lodha, Partner of the Colliery and Chotelal Naroria.

*For workmen*—Sri P. D. Sharma, workman concerned.

INDUSTRY: Coal Mine

DISTRICT: Dhanbad (Bihar).

**AWARD**

By Notification No. 2/134/64-LR.II dated 23rd December 1964, the following matter of dispute, as stated in the schedule to the order of reference, was referred to Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad for adjudication and from where it was transferred to this Tribunal by Notification No. 8/25/67-LR.II dated 25th April, 1967:

*Matter of Dispute*

Whether the stoppage of work of Shri P. D. Sharma, Attendance Clerk, with effect from the 24th March 1964 and again from the 20th April, 1964, was caused by the management of the Pure Dhansar Colliery? If so, whether this action of the management was justified and whether the workman is entitled to any relief?

2. The Union, Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, filed a statement of claim before the Dhanbad Tribunal. The employers filed their statement of claim-cum-rejoinder before this Tribunal on 15th June 1967. No rejoinder was filed by the Union. The employers absented on two subsequent dates fixed for hearing but later on subject to payment of certain costs, the *ex-parte* proceedings were set aside and employer's appearance was allowed on the hearing rendered on 15th December 1967 at camp Dhanbad. Full hearing was then rendered on 19th February 1968 at camp Dhanbad in presence of both the parties.

3. The admitted facts of the case are that Sri P. D. Sharma was a permanent employee of the Colliery, Pure Dhansar Colliery. One Sri Inder Kumar Agarwal was the Managing Agent of the Colliery and it was contended during arguments that the managing agency system has ceased to exist with effect from 1st July, 1967. Shri P. D. Sharma, hereinafter called Shri Sharma, was an Attendance Clerk in the Colliery. He proceeded on leave with effect from 17th February, 1964 to 2nd March, 1964 and went to his home village in Rajasthan (Ex. E/1). On the ground of illness he sent an application for extension of leave dated 28th February 1964 (Ex. E/2) under registered cover.

4. In the application he had mentioned that he was attaching a certificate of illness but actually none was so appended. The management refused to grant the leave and by letter dated 9th March, 1964 (Ex. E/4) intimated Sri Sharma that the

extension of leave was refused and he should report for duty immediately. According to Sri Sharma, on receipt of this communication he came back from home and reported for duty on 23rd March, 1964. He was not allowed to resume duty on which he submitted an application on 24th March 1964. Even so, he was not permitted to rejoin duty and therefore he submitted another application (Ex. W/1) dated 27th March 1964 making reference to his earlier application dated 24th March 1964 and praying that he should be allowed to re-join duty. He sent another application dated 4th April 1964 enclosing therewith a medical certificate of the Doctor (Ex. W/5) for his illness for the period 3rd March, 1964 to 20th March, 1964. On the same date management sent a communication (Ex. E/6) requiring him to explain the discrepancy that the medical certificate covers the period from 3rd March 1964 to 20th March 1964, whereas he had applied for leave on ground of illness from 28th February 1964. Sri Sharma thereupon sent a reply on 6th April 1964 (Ex. W/3) stating that in the beginning he was under the treatment of a *vaid* and then switched over to the treatment of Doctor thereby attempting to explain the absence of a medical certificate anterior to 3rd March, 1964. Sri Sharma was thereafter directed to work at the bungalow of the Managing Agent in the Accounts Section and it is an admitted case that from 7th April 1964 to 19th April 1964 he continued to work at the office of the Managing Agent. Meanwhile, the management was not satisfied with the explanation rendered by Sri Sharma and after communication dated 7th April, 1964 (Ex. E/7) requiring him to report for duty in the Accounts Section at the bungalow of the Managing Agent, sent another communication dated 13th April, 1964 requiring an explanation for the contradictory explanation within 24 hours and threatening disciplinary action. Sri Sharma, sent a reply to this communication on 14th April, 1964 (Ex. W/5) explaining the discrepancy. The management, however, took no further disciplinary proceedings and Sri Sharma continued to work in the Accounts Section upto 19th April. According to him he was stopped from working from 20th April, 1964, whereas according to the management, he himself stopped coming. A dispute was then raised on behalf of Sri Sharma by the Union which in due course resulted in this reference.

5. The first question to be considered is whether Sri Sharma did in fact report for duty or not on 23rd or 24th March, 1964. According to the management, Sri Sharma did not report on 23rd March but came to the bungalow of the Managing Agent in the evening when he behaved insolently and was directed to report to the colliery office on 27th which he did not do. There is abundant material to show that Sri Sharma did in fact appear and reported for duty on 23rd March. Besides his own testimony on the point, the applications which he gave on 27th March, 1964 wherein he maintained that he had been in station in the last four or five days and had applied on 24-3-64 to be permitted to resume duty corroborates him on the point. No communication was sent by the management controverting this allegation of Sri Sharma. The Head Clerk who appeared for the management, Sri Clarence Edverd Malvern (E. W. 1) had no knowledge as to what transpired between Sri Sharma and the Managing Agent and the managing agent himself has not come in evidence to controvert the allegation. It is manifest that he was not permitted to work till formally asked to work at the bungalow of the Managing Agent in the Accounts Section on 7-4-64 by means of Ex. E/7. The stand taken by the management that Sri Sharma himself did not report at the Colliery Office from 27-3-64 onwards is neither supported by any circumstance nor by any evidence whatsoever. Probably, the management thought that since they had not closed the question of reconciliation of the discrepancy in the medical certificate for the period 28-2-64 to 3-3-1964 they could prevent him from resuming duty. They, however, allowed him to resume duty with effect from 8-4-64 in the Accounts Section at the bungalow of the Managing Agent. The charge-sheet dated 13-4-64 (Ex. W. 4) was not pursued further and therefore, it is manifest that the management closed the chapter and allowed him to resume duty but only with effect from 8-4-64. Even no disciplinary proceedings were commenced after the charge-sheet dated 13-3-64 and the explanation which Sri Sharma gave on 14-4-64 (Ex. W/5).

6. The next question is whether from 20-4-64, Sri Sharma was stopped from working by the Managing Agent or he himself stopped coming. It is inconceivable that an employee who has been writing and representing over and over again should have himself stopped coming and rendering duty for no reason whatsoever. According to Sri Sharma, the Managing Agent wanted him to sign a letter agreeing to accept a temporary appointment to which he was not agreeable and at which he was asked not to come to work. This sworn testimony of Sri Sharma remained unassailed. The Head Clerk (E. W. 1) Sri C. E.

Malvern admitted that he has no knowledge about it. He, however, admitted that the Accounts Office was maintained at the bungalow of the Managing Agent and all employees both working at the bungalow of the Managing Agent and the Colliery were employees of the management and one could be transferred from one place to another. The best person to rebut this evidence of Sri Sharma would have been the Managing Agent himself who has not come in evidence. The irresistible conclusion is that Sri Sharma was prevented deliberately from working and was denied employment with effect from 20-4-64 because he refused to agree to a fresh and temporary appointment as stated by him.

7. On behalf of the management, it was contended that by his unauthorised absence beyond the 2nd March, 1964 his subsequent leave having not been sanctioned he lost his lien to appointment and reliance was placed on Clause 10(e) of the Model Standing Orders for Coal Mine Industry, there being no certified Standing Orders for this particular colliery. Under Clause 10(e), "If a workman remains absent beyond the period of leave originally granted or subsequently extended, he shall lose lien on his appointment unless he (a) returns within ten days of expiry of his leave, and (b) explains to the satisfaction of the manager his inability to return on the expiry of his leave. In case the workman loses his lien on the appointment, he shall be entitled to be kept on the 'Badli list'."

8. Further under Clause 10(g) a workman over-staying sanctioned leave without reasonable cause will render himself liable for disciplinary action. The management had not taken this stand that Sri Sharma had lost his lien under Cl. 10(e) and therefore he cannot be taken back. On the other hand, their stand was that he did not himself turn up and reported for duty even though asked to join at Colliery Office until he joined on 8th April in the Accounts Office of the Managing Agent. This is a new stand which was built up in the course of arguments. When the management did not take any action and permitted him to rejoin duty on 8th April, at the bungalow of the Managing Agent where he admittedly continued to work upto 19th April, there is no question of his losing the lien under this clause of the Model Standing Orders. The Supreme Court case of National Engineering Co. Ltd., Vs. Hanuman, (Civil Appeal No. 469 of 1967 dated 25-7-1967, reported in 1967 M. F. J. Vol. II, page 152, is clearly distinguishable and has no application. The charge-sheet dated 13-4-67 was also not for over-staying leave but he was required to explain the discrepancy proceedings which they could take under Cl. 10(g) of the Model Standing Orders were not proceeded further and was obviously dropped. Consequently, there is no merit in the contention of the management.

#### Decision

The result is that it must be held that Sri Sharma was denied employment from 24th March, 1964 to 8th April, 1964 unjustifiably and again from 20th April 1964 onwards. He is entitled to his wages from 24th March, 1964 to 7th April 1964 and again from 20th April, 1964 and shall be reinstated with back wages and continuity of service. The Union shall further be entitled to Rs 100/- as costs from the management.

(Sd.) G. C. AGARWALA,  
Presiding Officer.  
29-2-68

[No 2/134/64-LRII]

**S.O. 1031.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Bhadra Colliery (Prop. The Rewa Mining Company Limited), Post Office Kotma, District Shahdol (Madhya Pradesh) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 11th March, 1968.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,  
JABALPUR

Dated March 1, 1968

PRESENT:

Sri G. C. Agarwala—Presiding Officer.

CASE NO. CGIT/LC(R)(2) OF 1968

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to—

M/s. Bhadra Colliery (Prop. The Rewa Mining Company Ltd.), P.O. Kotma,  
Distt. Shahdol (M.P.).

Vs.

Their workmen represented through the Secretary, Colliery Mazdoor Union  
C/o. B. N. Singh, P.O. Kotma, District Shahdol (M.P.).

APPEARANCES:

For employers—None.

For workmen—None.

INDUSTRY: Coal Mine

DISTRICT: Shahdol (M.P.)

AWARD

By Notification No. 5/84/67/LR-II dated 6th January, 1968/16, Pausa 1889, the following matter of dispute as stated in the schedule to the order of reference was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication:

Matter of Dispute

Whether the action of the management of M/s. Bhadra Colliery, Kotma, in terminating the services of Shri Budhsen s/o Munda, Miner through their letter dated 14th August, 1967 is justified? If not to what relief is the workman entitled?

2. The order of reference was received by this Tribunal on 16-1-1968 Under Rule 10B of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, the parties were supposed to have filed their statements of claim within two weeks of the date of the receipt of the order of reference. As none was received within two weeks, as a matter of abundant caution notice was issued by this Tribunal on 17th February, 1968 giving the parties a further chance to file their statements of claim by or before 1st March, 1968. In spite of service of notice neither party has appeared nor has sent any statement of claim. It appears that the parties are not interested in the dispute. Since, however, an award has to be recorded and there is no statement of claim from either side this Tribunal has to depend on the failure report appended with the order of reference. On perusal of the failure report it appears that the workman concerned, Sri Budhsen, was granted leave from 3rd July, 1967 to 18th July, 1967. He was, however, recalled to work on 5th July, 1967 and continued to work upto 15th July, 1967. 16th July, 1967 was a Sunday, a day of weekly rest, and he availed of the earlier sanctioned leave from 17th July. When he appeared for work on 2nd August, 1967 he was denied work. The management before the Conciliation Officer simply intimated that the question of termination of service of Sri Budhsen was under enquiry. The Union, however, intimated the Conciliation Officer that there was no question of enquiry and services of Sri Budhsen had been terminated by a letter dated 14th August, 1967 on the ground that he had been absenting without leave. This stand of the management was unjustified inasmuch as the workman, Sri Budhsen, had proceeded on unavailed leave after he had been recalled for duty on the originally sanctioned leave for the period 3rd May to 18th July, 1967. There being no case of the management before the Conciliation Officer nor before this Tribunal it must be held on the basis of the conciliation report that the termination of service of Sri Budhsen was unjustified.

DECISION:

Sri Budhsen, workman concerned, shall be reinstated and shall be entitled to back wages with continuity of service. No order for costs.

(Sd.) G. C. AGARWALA.  
1-3-1968.

Presiding Officer.

[No. 5/84/67-LR.II.]

## ORDERS

*New Delhi, the 13th March 1968*

**S.O. 1032.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Chorawari and Hirdagarh Collieries Post Officer Junnordeo, District Chhindwara (Madhya Pradesh) and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

whether the management of the Ghorawari and Hidragarh Collieries, Post Office Junnordeo District Chhindwara (Madhya Pradesh) was justified in dismissing Shri Sheodhar, Writer, from the 1st May, 1967? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

[No. 5/4/68-LRII.]

**S.O. 1033.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Mathani Colliery of Messrs Equitable Coal Company Limited, Post Office Dishergarh, District Burdwan and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed.

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

## SCHEDULE

Whether the dismissal of Shri Bijoyhari Chatterjee, Provident Fund Clerk, by the management of Methani Colliery with effect from the 10th November, 1967 was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

[No. F. 6/12/68(LRII).]

**S.O. 1034.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Lakurka Colliery of Messrs Lakurka Coal Company Limited, Post Office Katrasgarh, District Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed:

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

## SCHEDULE

Whether the management of Lakurka Colliery of Messrs Lakurka Coal Company Limited, Post Office Katrasgarh, District Dhanbad was justified in refusing the post of Prop. Mistry to Shri Habib Mian with effect from the 4th May, 1967? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

[No. F. 2/157/67-LRII.]

*New Delhi, the 14th March 1968*

**S.O. 1035.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Bon-Jamihari Colliery, Post Office, Salanpur, District Burdwan and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;



And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

#### SCHEDULE

- (1) Whether the retrenchment of Sarvashri Mathan Singh and Kallash Singh, Surface Pump Khalasis by the management of Bon-Jamihari Colliery, Post Office Salanpur, District Burdwan, with effect from the 26th December, 1967 was justified?
- (2) If not, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?

[No. F. 6/14/68-LRII.]

#### CORRIGENDUM

*New Delhi, the 14th March 1968*

**S.O. 1036.**—In the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 4175, dated the 18th November, 1967 published at page 4450 of the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, sub-section (ii), dated the 2nd December, 1967,

in line 3 of the Schedule, for "in transferring Sarvashri Gope and Sukdeo Dusadh, Prop. Mazdoors" read "in transferring Sarvashri Teklal Gope Prop. Mazdoor and Sukdeo Dusadh, Prop. Mistry."

[No. 2/122/67-LNII.]

BALWANT SINGH, Under Secy.

#### (Department of Labour and Employment)

*New Delhi, the 11th March 1968*

**S.O. 1037.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints the 17th day of March, 1968, as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except section 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapters V and VI [except sub-section (1) of section 76 and section 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force] of the said Act shall come into force in the following areas in the State of Andhra Pradesh, namely:—

The area situated within the Municipal Limits of Tirupati and adjoining Revenue village of 32 Konka-Chennaiah Gunta and 22 Daminedu whose boundaries are specified as under:—

*North.*—Tirumalai Hills Reserve Forest; 30 Thambuvanigunta; 31 Korlagunta; 27 Akkarampalle; 26 Upparapaliem.

*East.*—21 Thukkivakkam; 35 Koravenigunta; 36 Tiruchanur.

*South.*—36 Tiruchanur; 49 Avilala.

*West.*—29 Tirupati Revenue village.

I

[No. F. 13(5)/68-HI.]

**S.O. 1038.**—In pursuance of section 11 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby accepts the resignation of Dr. (Mrs) Suborna Mitra from her membership of the Medical Benefit Council constituted under the said Act.

[No. F. 3/2/68-HI.]

*New Delhi, the 12th March 1968*

**S.O. 1039.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government, having regard to the location of the factories in implemented areas, hereby exempts the depots at Tondiarpet, Adyar, Ayanavaram, Tiruchirapalli (Trichy) and Coimbatore, belonging to the Madras State Transport Department, from the payment of the employer's special contribution leviable under chapter VA of the said Act for a further period of one year with effect from the 24th March, 1968.

[No. F. 6(23)/68-HI.]

**S.O. 1040.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. Holla and sons, Mechanical and Automobile Engineers, Opposite Government College, Mangalore-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act, to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 31st day of January, 1968.

[No. 8/20/68/PF-II.]

**S.O. 1041.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. Bullows India Private Limited, Great-Social Building, Sir P. M. Road, Bombay-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act, to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 30th day of November, 1967.

[No. 8/30/68/PF-II.]

**S.O. 1042.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. Escal India Private Limited, P. 34, C.I.T. Road, Calcutta-14, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act, to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 31st day of December, 1967.

[No. 8/29/68/PF-II.]

**S.O. 1043.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. Inland Trading Company, P-14, Mission Row Extension, Calcutta have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act, to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 29th day of February, 1968.

[No. 8/38/68/PF-II.]

**S.O. 1044.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as The Ashok Leyland Employees' Cooperative Bank Limited, 299, T. H. Road, Madras-21, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act, to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 29th day of February, 1968.

[No. 8/42/68/PF-II.]

**S.O. 1045.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. Udupi Sri Krishna Cafe, Gandhi Chow, Tenali, Guntur District (A.P.), have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act, to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 31st day of January, 1968.

[No. 8/26/68/PF-II.]

**S.O. 1046.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. G. S. Murti, Ch. Agastayya and Company, 20/54, Old Bank Lane, Visakhapatnam (A.P.) have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act, to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 31st day of January, 1968.

[No. 8/39/68/PF-II.]

**S.O. 1047.**—Whereas the Central Government is satisfied that the employees of the under-mentioned factories, belonging to the Central Government in the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply, (Department of Works and Housing) and placed under the control of the Central Public Works Department, are otherwise in receipt of benefits substantially similar to the benefits provided under the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948);

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 90 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948, the Central Government hereby exempts the said factories after consultation with the Corporation, from all the provisions of the said Act for a further period of one year with effect from the 15th March, 1968, namely:—

1. The Electric Fans, Motors and other Appliances Repairs Shop, Central Public Works Department, New Delhi.
2. The Horticulture Tools and Implements Repairs Shop, New Delhi.
3. The Central Public Works Department Auto and General Workshop and Foundry, American Warehouse, Factory Road, New Delhi.
4. Desert Coolers Workshop, Vidyut Bhawan, New Delhi.
5. Mechanical and Transport Workshop, Dum Dum.

[No. F. 6(21)/68-HI.]

*New Delhi, the 13th March 1968*

**S.O. 1048.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. CIO Full Mould Tyre-Retreaders (India) 32, Mill and Godown Area, Tata

Nagar, Jamshedpur (Bihar) have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment with effect from the 31st March 1968.

[No. 8/40/68/PF-II.]

**S.O. 1049.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Sarvashri A. U. Chavda and J. L. Ranpura to be Inspectors for the whole of the State of Gujarat for the purposes of the said Act and of any Scheme framed thereunder, in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of, the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oil field or a controlled industry.

[No. 20(62)/64-PF.I.]

**S.O. 1050.**—In pursuance of clause (a) of sub-paragraph (1) of paragraph 4 of the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints the Special Secretary to the Government of Andhra Pradesh, Home (Labour) Department, as the Chairman of the Regional Committee for the State of Andhra Pradesh and makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the late Department of Social Security No. S.O. 1294, dated the 8th April, 1965, namely:—

In the said notification against Serial No. 1, for the existing entry in the 1st column, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

"The Special Secretary to the Government of Andhra Pradesh, Home (Labour) Department, Hyderabad."

[No. 12/1/68-PF II.]

*New Delhi, the 14th March 1968*

**S.O. 1051.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. Prashanth, Ashok Road, Tumkur have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 31st day of January, 1968.

[No. 8/27/68/PF-II.]

**S.O. 1052.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as The Bihar State Agro-Industries Development Corporation Limited, Boring Canal Road, Patna have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said Establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 31st day of July, 1967.

[No. 8/209/67/PF-II.]

**S.O. 1053.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. Deolai Gliding Club, Gandhi Nagar, Nasik-6 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 31st day of July, 1968.

[No. 8(52)/66-PF-II.]

**S.O. 1054.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. M. Vaman Nayak and Sons, K. S. Rao Road, Mangalore-1 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall come into force on the 31st day of March, 1968.

[No. 8/49/68-PF-II.]

**S.O. 1055.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Feroz Trading Company, Tannery Ambur, North Arcot District, Madras State have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall come into force on the 31st day of March, 1968.

[No. 8/50/68/PF-II.]

**S.O. 1056.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Automac (Madras) Private Limited, 17, Tunkur Road, Bangalore-22, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 29th day of February, 1968.

[No. 8/35/68/PF-II.]

**S.O. 1057.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Malai Murasu Group, 2-16, Mount Road, Madras-2 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 29th day of February, 1968.

[No. 8/36/68/PF-II.]

**S.O. 1058.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Vivekam and Company, Agents and General Merchants, 90-A/1, South Raja Street, Tuticorin-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall come into force on the 31st March, 1968.

[No. 8/44/68-PF-II.]

**S.O. 1059.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. Excel Phospho-Chem, Hindustan Antibiotics Compound, Pimpri, Poona-18 (Maharashtra State) have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 31st day of October 1967.

[No. 8(227)/67-PF-II.]

**S.O. 1060.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri P. V. Subramaniam to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Madras for the purposes of the said Act and of any Scheme framed thereunder in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of, the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oil-field or a controlled industry.

[No. F. 20(9)/68PF.I.]

*New Delhi, the 18th March 1968*

**S.O. 1061.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints the 24th day of March, 1968 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapters V and VI (except sub-section (1) of section 76 and sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force) of the said Act shall come into force in the following area in the State of Mysore, namely:—

Area situated within the Municipal limits of Harihar Town.

[No. F. 13(7)/68-HI.]

**S.O. 1062.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints the 24th day of March, 1968 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapters V and VI (except sub-section (1) of section 76 and sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force) of the said Act shall come into force in the following areas in the State of Kerala, namely:—

"The areas within the revenue villages of Perunad, Kulasekharapuram, Krishnapuram; Thazhava, Thodiyoor, Mynagapally, Thevalakkara, Panmana and Karunagapally in the Karunagapally Taluk in the Quilon District."

[No. F. 13(11)/68-HI.]

**S.O. 1063.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints the 24th day of March, 1968 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapters V and VI (except sub-section (1) of section 76 and sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force) of the said Act shall come into force in the following area in the State of Kerala, namely:—

The area comprising the revenue village of Thiruvallam in the Trivandrum Taluk in the Trivandrum District.

[No. F. 13(8)/68-HI.]

**S.O. 1064.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints the 24th day of March, 1968 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into

force) and Chapters V and VI (except sub-section (1) of section 76 and sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force) of the said Act shall come into force in the following areas in the State of Orissa, namely:—

Areas comprising the revenue villages of Kansbahal, Chungimati, Dholua and Panposh, Police Station Rajgangpur in the District of Sundergarh.

[No. F. 13(13)/68-HI.]

**S.O. 1065.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Kudianavala Associates, Mackinnon Mackenzie Building, Ballard Estate, Bombay-1 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall come into force on the 31st March, 1968.

[No. F. 8/45/68-PF.II.]

**S.O. 1066.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry, hereby specified that in its application to M/s. Dolton Agencies 2 and 3 Arcot Road, Vadapalani, Madras-26, with effect from the 31st March, 1968, section 6 of the said Act shall be subject to the modification that for the words 'six and a quarter per cent', the words 'eight per cent' shall be substituted.

[No. F. 8/21/68-PF.II.]

**S.O. 1067.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Dolton Agencies 2 and 3, Arcot Road, Vadapalani, Madras-26, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall come into force on the 31st day of March, 1968.

[No. F. 8/21/68/PF-II.]

**S.O. 1068.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Baroda Dies and Tools, 3/27/28, Industrial Estate, Baroda-3 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 29th day of February, 1968.

[No. F. 8/37/68/PF-II.]

DALJIT SINGH, Under Secy.

(Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 12th March 1968

**S.O. 1069/PWA/Sec.7(2)(e).**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (e) of sub-section (2) of section 7, read with section 24 of the Payment of Wages Act, 1936 (4 of 1936), the Central Government hereby specifies the Chief Labour Commissioner (Central), New Delhi, as the officer who may authorise deductions in respect of the amenity of canteens provided by an employer in relation to railways, air transport

services, mines and oil-fields, and imposes the following conditions under section 11 of the said Act, subject to which such deductions shall be made, namely:—

- (i) that no deduction shall be made from the wages of the employed person unless he has communicated in writing his acceptance to the deduction, such acceptance being given once generally and not necessarily on each occasion a deduction is made;
- (ii) that no deduction shall [subject to the outer limit of deductions laid down in section 7(3) of the Act] exceed—
  - (a) 25 per cent of the wages of an employed person in the case of workers who avail of facilities of full meals in the canteen, and
  - (b) 10 per cent of the wages of an employed person in the case of workers who do not avail of the facilities of full meals in the canteen,

for any wage period.

[No. 536/7/64-Fac. I.]

**S.O. 1070 PWA/Sec. 15(1)ATS/68.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 15, read with section 24, of the Payment of Wages Act, 1936 (4 of 1936), the Central Government hereby appoints every officer appointed by the Governments of the States of Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Madras, Maharashtra, Mysore, Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Nagaland and Haryana and the Union territories of Delhi, Manipur, Tripura, the Andaman and Nicobar Islands and the Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Goa, Daman and Diu, Pondicherry and Chandigarh, under the said sub-section (1) of section 15, in respect of any specified area within the said States or Union territories, to be the authority to hear and decide all claims arising out of deductions from the wages, or delay in payment of the wages, of persons employed or paid within such area, including all matters incidental to such claims, in air transport services.

[No. F. 638/6/66-Fac.I.]

J. D. TEWARI, Under Secy.

### (Department of Labour and Employment)

*New Delhi, the 12th March 1968*

**S.O. 1071.**—The following draft of a scheme further to amend the Calcutta Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1957, which the Central Government proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), is published as required by the said sub-section for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby; and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the 11th April, 1968.

Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the date so specified will be taken into consideration by the Central Government.

#### *Draft Scheme*

1. This Scheme may be called the Calcutta Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Scheme, 1968.

2. In the Calcutta Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1957, after clause 14, the following new clause shall be inserted:—

*"14-A. Special provision in respect of workers involved in criminal charges:*

*Notwithstanding anything contained in the Scheme—*

- (i) A worker arrested or detained by the police on a criminal charge (hereinafter referred to as the 'charge') for a period exceeding 48 hours shall be deemed to have been suspended by an order of the Deputy Chairman with effect from the date of detention and shall remain under suspension until further orders. In cases of arrest or detention for a period not exceeding 48 hours the worker may be placed under suspension if the Deputy Chairman thinks fit and proper.



- (ii) If the worker is released on bail the question whether the worker should be allowed to resume duty shall be considered by the Deputy Chairman. While permission to resume duty may be granted where the offence is a trivial or technical one, no such permission shall be granted if there is a serious charge particularly involving moral turpitude, and the decision of the Deputy Chairman shall be final.
- (iii) In every such case the Administrative Body shall also ascertain whether the charge relates to his work or position as a dock worker. If the worker appears to be *prima-facie* guilty of misconduct or negligence of duty he should also be proceeded with in accordance with the provisions of the scheme, and such proceedings may ordinarily be undertaken and continued without waiting for the outcome of the Criminal case.
- (iv) In cases where the charge does not relate to the conduct of the worker as a dock worker, no decision shall be taken till the decision of the criminal court is known. As soon as the decision of the court is known, it shall be communicated to the Deputy Chairman for the issue of orders as to how the worker is to be dealt with.
- (v) If the worker is discharged or honourably acquitted by the Court he shall ordinarily be allowed to resume duty, the period under suspension being treated as a period on duty.
- (vi) If the worker is convicted of a charge which is considered to be of such a nature as to render his further continuance as a dock worker undesirable, the Deputy Chairman may on taking into account the facts and circumstances of the case direct the removal of the name of the worker from the Register. In any other case, the Deputy Chairman may pass such orders as he thinks fit and proper.

[No. 53/22/67-Fac. II.]

**S.O. 1072.**—The following draft of a scheme further to amend the Bombay Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1956, which the Central Government proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), is published as required by the said sub-section for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby; and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the 11th April, 1968.

Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the date so specified will be taken into consideration by the Central Government.

#### *Draft Scheme*

1. This Scheme may be called the Bombay Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Scheme, 1968.

2. In the Bombay Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1956 after clause 44, the following new clause shall be inserted:—

“44-A. *Special provision in respect of workers involved in criminal charges:*

Notwithstanding anything contained in the Scheme—

- (i) A worker arrested or detained by the police on a criminal charge (hereinafter referred to as the ‘charge’) for a period exceeding 48 hours shall be deemed to have been suspended by an order of the Deputy Chairman with effect from the date of detention and shall remain under suspension until further orders. In cases of arrest or detention for a period not exceeding 48 hours the worker may be placed under suspension if the Deputy Chairman thinks fit and proper.
- (ii) If the worker is released on bail the question whether the worker should be allowed to resume duty shall be considered by the Deputy Chairman. While permission to resume duty may be granted where the offence is a trivial or technical one, no such permission shall be granted if there is a serious charge particularly involving moral turpitude, and the decision of the Deputy Chairman shall be final.
- (iii) In every such case the Administrative Body shall also ascertain whether the charge relates to his work or position as a dock worker. If the worker appears to be *prima-facie* guilty of misconduct or negligence of

duty he should also be proceeded with in accordance with the provisions of the scheme, and such proceedings may ordinarily be undertaken and continued without waiting for the outcome of the Criminal case.

- (iv) In cases where the charge does not relate to the conduct of the worker as a dock worker, no decision shall be taken till the decision of the criminal court is known. As soon as the decision of the court is known, it shall be communicated to the Deputy Chairman for the issue of orders as to how the worker is to be dealt with.
- (v) If the worker is discharged or honourably acquitted by the Court he shall ordinarily be allowed to resume duty, the period under suspension being treated as a period on duty.
- (vi) If the worker is convicted of a charge which is considered to be of such a nature as to render his further continuance as a dock worker undesirable, the Deputy Chairman may on taking into account the facts and circumstances of the case direct the removal of the name of the worker from the Register. In any other case, the Deputy Chairman may pass such orders as he thinks fit and proper.

[No. 53/22/67-Fac. II.]

**S.O. 1073.**—The following draft of a scheme further to amend the Bombay Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1957, which the Central Government proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), is published as required by the said sub-section for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby; and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the 11th April, 1968.

Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the date so specified will be taken into consideration by the Central Government.

#### *Draft Scheme*

1. This Scheme may be called the Bombay Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Scheme, 1968.

2. In the Bombay Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1957, after clause 14, the following new clause shall be inserted:—

“14-A. *Special provision in respect of workers involved in criminal charges:*

Notwithstanding anything contained in the Scheme—

- (i) A worker arrested or detained by the police on a criminal charge (hereinafter referred to as the ‘charge’) for a period exceeding 48 hours shall be deemed to have been suspended by an order of the Deputy Chairman with effect from the date of detention and shall remain under suspension until further orders. In cases of arrest or detention for a period not exceeding 48 hours the worker may be placed under suspension if the Deputy Chairman thinks fit and proper.
- (ii) If the worker is released on bail the question whether the worker should be allowed to resume duty shall be considered by the Deputy Chairman. While permission to resume duty may be granted where the offence is a trivial or technical one, no such permission shall be granted if there is a serious charge particularly involving moral turpitude, and the decision of the Deputy Chairman shall be final.
- (iii) In every such case the Administrative Body shall also ascertain whether the charge relates to his work or position as a dock worker. If the worker appears to be *prima-facie* guilty of misconduct or negligence of duty he should also be proceeded with in accordance with the provisions of the scheme, and such proceedings may ordinarily be undertaken and continued without waiting for the outcome of the Criminal case.
- (iv) In cases where the charge does not relate to the conduct of the worker as a dock worker, no decision shall be taken till the decision of the criminal court is known. As soon as the decision of the court is known, it shall be communicated to the Deputy Chairman for the issue of orders as to how the worker is to be dealt with.

- (v) If the worker is discharged or honourably acquitted by the Court he shall ordinarily be allowed to resume duty, the period under suspension being treated as a period on duty.
- (vi) If the worker is convicted of a charge which is considered to be of such a nature as to render his further continuance as a dock worker undesirable, the Deputy Chairman may on taking into account the facts and circumstances of the case direct the removal of the name of the worker from the Register. In any other case, the Deputy Chairman may pass such orders as he thinks fit and proper.

[No. 53/22/67-Fac. II.]

**S.O. 1074.**—The following draft of a scheme further to amend the Vizagapatam Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1959, which the Central Government proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), is published as required by the said sub-section for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby; and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the 11th April, 1968.

Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the date so specified will be taken into consideration by the Central Government.

#### *Draft Scheme*

1. This Scheme may be called the Vizagapatam Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Scheme, 1968.

2. In the Vizagapatam Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1959 after clause 44, the following new clause shall be inserted:—

*"44-A. Special provision in respect of workers involved in criminal charges:*

*Notwithstanding anything contained in the Scheme—*

- (i) A worker arrested or detained by the police on a criminal charge (hereinafter referred to as the 'charge') for a period exceeding 48 hours shall be deemed to have been suspended by an order of the Deputy Chairman with effect from the date of detention and shall remain under suspension until further orders. In cases of arrest or detention for a period not exceeding 48 hours the worker may be placed under suspension if the Deputy Chairman thinks fit and proper.
- (ii) If the worker is released on bail the question whether the worker should be allowed to resume duty shall be considered by the Deputy Chairman. While permission to resume duty may be granted where the offence is a trivial or technical one, no such permission shall be granted if there is a serious charge particularly involving moral turpitude, and the decision of the Deputy Chairman shall be final.
- (iii) In every such case the Administrative Body shall also ascertain whether the charge relates to his work or position as a dock worker. If the worker appears to be *prima-facie* guilty of misconduct or negligence of duty he should also be proceeded with in accordance with the provisions of the scheme, and such proceedings may ordinarily be undertaken and continued without waiting for the outcome of the Criminal case.
- (iv) In cases where the charge does not relate to the conduct of the worker as a dock worker, no decision shall be taken till the decision of the criminal court is known. As soon as the decision of the court is known it shall be communicated to the Deputy Chairman for the issue of orders as to how the worker is to be dealt with.
- (v) If the worker is discharged or honourably acquitted by the Court he shall ordinarily be allowed to resume duty, the period under suspension being treated as a period on duty.
- (vi) If the worker is convicted of a charge which is considered to be of such a nature as to render his further continuance as a dock worker undesirable, the Deputy Chairman may on taking into account the facts and circumstances of the case direct the removal of the name of the worker from the Register. In any other case, the Deputy Chairman may pass such orders as he thinks fit and proper.

[No. 53/22/67-Fac. II.]

**S.O. 1075.**—The following draft of a scheme further to amend the Calcutta Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1956, which the Central Government proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), is published as required by the said sub-section for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby; and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the 11th April, 1968.

Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the date so specified will be taken into consideration by the Central Government.

#### *Draft Scheme*

1. This Scheme may be called the Calcutta Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Scheme, 1968.

2. In the Calcutta Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1956, after clause 45, the following new clause shall be inserted:—

*"45-A. Special provision in respect of workers involved in criminal charges:*

*Notwithstanding anything contained in the Scheme—*

- (i) A worker arrested or detained by the police on a criminal charge (herein-after referred to as the 'charge') for a period exceeding 48 hours shall be deemed to have been suspended by an order of the Deputy Chairman with effect from the date of detention and shall remain under suspension until further orders. In cases of arrest or detention for a period not exceeding 48 hours the worker may be placed under suspension if the Deputy Chairman thinks fit and proper.
- (ii) If the worker is released on bail the question whether the worker should be allowed to resume duty shall be considered by the Deputy Chairman. While permission to resume duty may be granted where the offence is a trivial or technical one, no such permission shall be granted if there is a serious charge particularly involving moral turpitude, and the decision of the Deputy Chairman shall be final.
- (iii) In every such case the Administrative Body shall also ascertain whether the charge relates to his work or position as a dock worker. If the worker appears to be *prima-facie* guilty of misconduct or negligence of duty he should also be proceeded with in accordance with the provisions of the scheme, and such proceedings may ordinarily be undertaken and continued without waiting for the outcome of the Criminal case.
- (iv) In cases where the charge does not relate to the conduct of the worker as a dock worker, no final decision shall be taken till the decision of the criminal court is known. As soon as the decision of the court is known, it shall be communicated to the Deputy Chairman for the issue of orders as to how the worker is to be dealt with.
- (v) If the worker is discharged or honourably acquitted by the Court he shall ordinarily be allowed to resume duty, the period under suspension being treated as a period on duty.
- (vi) If the worker is convicted of a charge which is considered to be of such a nature as to render his further continuance as a dock worker undesirable, the Deputy Chairman may on taking into account the facts and circumstances of the case direct the removal of the name of the worker from the Register. In any other case, the Deputy Chairman may pass such orders as he thinks fit and proper.

[No. 53/22/67-Fac. II.]

*New Delhi, the 13th March 1968*

**S.O. 1076.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 26 of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 (11 of 1948), the Central Government hereby directs that, for a period of two years from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette, the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 18 of the said Act, in so far as it requires a Register of Overtime and Muster Roll to be maintained in the prescribed forms, namely, Forms IV and V of the Minimum Wages (Central) Rules, 1950, shall not apply in relation to the employees of Bombay Port Trust, for whom minimum rates of wages have been fixed under the said Act, subject to the condition that particulars of such employees shall be maintained in Form G-14 B which is set out in the Schedule to this notification

and which shall be deemed to be the Register of Overtime and Muster Roll aforesaid for the purpose of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 (11 of 1948) and the Minimum Wages (Central) Rules, 1950 and subject also to the condition that the number of hours of overtime put in by a worker on different dates as well as the total of overtime work put in by the worker in a month shall be indicated in the proposed form under columns 11 and 12, respectively, in the line immediately following the line on which the name of the workers is entered.

## SCHEDULE

*Muster Roll for the Month of 196*

Date of Appoint- ment	Leave			Sl. No.	Designation	Name	Father's/Husband's Name	Minimum Wage Rs.	Sex
	Earned	Casual	Sick						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

*Muster Roll for the Month of*

196 .

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
II																

18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	No. of days	Rate per month	Overtime rate	Normal hours per week
II														12	13	14	15

No. of days for which overtime is admissible	under	Pay and Allowances						Over- time	Gross Wages Payable
		Pay	Acting Allowance	Other allowances & Dearness Pay	House Rent Allowance	Compensa- tory Allowance	Dearness Allowance		
		Rs. P	Rs.P	Rs. P	Rs. P	Rs. P	Rs. P		
M.W.A.	P.T. Rules								
16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25

**(Department of Labour and Employment)**

*New Delhi, the 14th March 1968*

**S.O. 1077.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 4 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 1300, dated the 5th April, 1967—

In the Table annexed to the said notification, against Serial No 38, for the entry "Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Jharsuguda" in column 2, the following entry shall be inserted, namely:—

"Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Rourkela."

[No. F. 1/17/68-LRI.]

**ORDERS**

*New Delhi, the 13th March 1968*

**S.O. 1078.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Calcutta Insurance Limited and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

**SCHEDULE**

Whether the demand of the General Insurance Employees' Association for confirmation of the services of the undernamed employees of the Calcutta Insurance Limited is justified? If so, to what relief are they entitled and from what date?

- (1) Shri Samarendra Nath Sarkar
- (2) Shri Sushil Kumar Dey
- (3) Shri Sudhansu Bhusan Bhattacharjee.

[No. 25/4/68-LR.III.]

*New Delhi, the 13th March 1968*

**S.O. 1079.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Rajaramka Bros. (P) Limited, Tumsar and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

**SCHEDULE**

Whether the termination of services of Shri Chatru s/o Machhu Gond (employed at Miragpur Mines of Seth Gopkisan Agarwal) with effect from the 15th May, 1967 by the management of Messrs Rajaramka Bros. (P) Limited, Tumsar was justified? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

[No. 35/1/67-LRI.]

O. P. TALWAR, Under Secy.



**MINISTRY OF FINANCE**

**(Department of Economic Affairs)**

*New Delhi, the 5th March 1968*

**S.O. 1080.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of section 9 of the said Act shall not apply to the Hindustan Commercial Bank Ltd., Kanpur, in respect of the property held by it at Dhoipur, till the 15th March, 1969.

[No. F. 15(4)-BC/68.]

New Delhi, the 14th March 1968

S.O. 1081—Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, as on the 8th March, 1968.

BANKING DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital Paid Up . . . . .	5,00,00,000	Notes . . . . .	24,40,68,000
		Rupee Coin . . . . .	3,20,000
Reserve Fund . . . . .	80,00,00,000	Small Coin . . . . .	3,06,000
		Bills Purchased and Discounted:—	
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund .	131,00,00,000	(a) Internal . . . . .	..
		(b) External . . . . .	..
		(c) Government Treasury Bills . . . . .	173,96,71,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund . . . . .	25,00,00,000	Balances Held Abroad* . . . . .	156,47,99,000
		Investments** . . . . .	110,63,78,000
		Loans and Advances to:—	
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund .	30,00,00,000	(i) Central Government . . . . .	..
		(ii) State Governments@ . . . . .	107,90,43,000
Deposits:—		Loans and Advances to:—	
(a) Government—		(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks† . . . . .	121,08,16,000
(i) Central Government . . . . .	112,65,74,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks‡ . . . . .	192,34,83,000
(ii) State Governments , , , , ,	4,63,33,000	(iii) Others , , , , ,	3,11,15,000

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA: MARCH 20, 1968

Loans, Advances and Investments from National  
Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund—

(b) Banks—		(a) Loans and Advances to :—	
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks . . . . .	122,47,98,000	(i) State Governments . . . . .	27,49,79,000
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	5,22,95,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	12,79,34,000
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	75,61,000	(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks . . . . .	..
(iv) Other Banks . . . . .	9,28,000	(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures . . . . .	7,89,36,000
(c) Others . . . . .	363,18,83,000	Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund—	
Bills Payable . . . . .	27,87,47,000	Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	7,70,57,000
Other Liabilities . . . . .	101,35,86,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Indus- trial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund—	
		(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank . . . . .	5,97,38,000
		(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank . . . . .	..
		Other Assets . . . . .	57,40,62,000
Rupees . . . . .	1009,27,05,000	Rupees . . . . .	1009,27,05,000

\*Includes Cash and Short-term Securities.

••Excluding Investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

@Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

† Includes Rs. 96,06,96,000 advanced to scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under Section 17(4)(c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act

† Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

Dated the 13th day of March, 1968.

An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 8th day of March 1968.

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department . . . . .	24,40,68,000		Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
Notes in circulation . . . . .	3213,36,82,000		(a) Held in India . . . . .	115,89,25,000	
Total Notes issued . . . . .		3237,77,50,000	(b) Held outside India . . . . .		
			Foreign Securities . . . . .	166,42,00,000	
			TOTAL . . . . .		282,31,25,000
			Rupee Coin . . . . .		75,19,31,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities . . . . .		2880,26,94,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other Commercial paper . . . . .		
TOTAL LIABILITIES . . . . .		3237,77,50,000	TOTAL ASSETS . . . . .		3237,77,50,000

Dated the 13th day of March 1968.

L. K. JHA,  
Governor.

[No F. 3(3)-BC/68.]

*New Delhi, the 16th March 1968*

**S.O. 1082.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of section 9 of the said Act shall not apply to the Gauhati Bank Ltd., Gauhati in respect of the undernoted properties held by it, till the 31st March 1969.

1. 4B-OK-8L of land; Patta No 40, Vill. Barpanara, Karara.
2. 4B-4K-11L of land; Patta Nos. 8, 77, 79, 82 and 88, Mauza-Khata
3. 6B-4K-4L of land; Patta Nos 260 (216) and 13, Mauza-Silasundari ghopa and Beltola.
4. 2B of land; Patta No. 88, Mauza-Bahjani.
5. 4B-17L of land; Patta Nos. 2, Barpeta Town.

[No. F. 15(5)-BC/68.]

**S.O. 1083.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 read with section 56, of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of section 31 of the said Act and Rule 10 of the Banking Regulation (Co-operative Societies) Rules, 1966, shall not apply to the under-noted co-operative banks in so far as they relate to the publication of their balance sheets and profit and loss accounts for the year ended the 30th June 1967, together with the auditors' reports in a newspaper.

1. Adilabad Jilla Kendra Sahakari, Adilabad.
2. Bhimavaram Co-operative Urban Bank Ltd., Bhimavaram (West Godavary).
3. Dharmavaram Co-operative Town Bank Ltd., Dharmavaram (Anantapur).
4. Kalahasti Co-operative Town Bank Ltd., Kalahasti (Chittoor).
5. Kollur Parvati Co-operative Bank Ltd., Kollur (Guntur).
6. Ongole Co-operative Bank Ltd., Ongole (Guntur).
7. Repalle Co-operative Bank Ltd., Repalle (Guntur).
8. I.L.T.D. Staff Co-operative Bank Ltd., Chirala (Guntur).
9. Hindustan Shipyard Staff Co-operative Bank Ltd., Visakhapatnam-5.
10. The Co-operative Bank Ltd., No 2935, Salur (Srikakulam).
11. Chipurupalli Co-operative Urban Bank Ltd., Chipurupalli (Srikakulam).
12. Andhra Pradesh Civil Audit Staff Co-operative Bank Ltd., Hyderabad.
13. Chirala Co-operative Town Bank Ltd., Chirala (Guntur).
14. Dibrugarh Central Co-operative Bank Ltd., Dibrugarh (Lakhimpur).
15. Nutan Mills Employees' Co-operative Credit Society Ltd., Ahmedabad.
16. Shree Gajanan Sahakari Pedhi Ltd., Patan (Mehsana).
17. Peoples Co-operative Bank Ltd., Dholka (Ahmedabad).
18. Sihor Nagrik Sahakari Bank Ltd., Sihor (Bhavnagar).
19. Khedbrahma Nagrik Sahakari Bank Ltd., Khedbrahma (Saharkantha).
20. Social Co-operative Bank Ltd., Ahmedabad.
21. Shree Deesa Nagrik Sahakari Bank Ltd., Deesa (Banaskantha).

22. Alavi Co-operative Bank Ltd., Baroda.
23. Surat Mercantile Co-operative Bank Ltd., Surat.
24. Baroda People's Co-operative Bank Ltd., Baroda.
25. Padra Nagar Nagrik Sahakari Bank Ltd., Padra (Baroda).
26. Chanasama Nagrik Sahakari Bank Ltd., Chanasama (Mehsana).
27. Kalyan Co-operative Bank Ltd., Kalol (Mehsana).
28. Anantasayanam Co-operative Society Ltd., Trivandrum.
29. The Railway Employees' Co-operative Bank Ltd., Madras-3.
30. The Shree Meenakshi Mills Employees' Co-operative Bank Ltd., Madurai.
31. The Government Telegraph Employees' Co-operative Society Ltd., Madras.
32. Bhingar Urban Co-operative Bank Ltd., Bhingar (Ahmednagar).
33. Raver Peoples' Co-operative Bank Ltd., Raver (Jalgaon).
34. Panvel Co-operative Urban Bank Ltd., Panvel (Kolaba).
35. Janata Sahakari Urban Bank Ltd., Sholapur.
36. Peoples' Co-operative Bank Ltd., Amaravati.
37. National Co-operative Bank Ltd., Bombay-1.
38. C.K.P. Co-operative Credit Bank Ltd., Dadar (Bombay-28).
39. Friends' Co-operative Credit Society Ltd., Bombay-9.
40. Maratha Paraspar Sahavakari Patpedhi Ltd., Lower Colaba (Bombay-5).
41. Needs of Life Co-operative Bank Ltd., Fort, Bombay-1.
42. Rahuri People's Co-operative Bank Ltd., Rahuri (Ahmednagar).
43. Vengurla Co-operative Urban Bank Ltd., Vengurla (Ratnagiri).
44. Sakharwadi Kamgar Sahakari Patpedhi Ltd., Sakharwadi (Satara).
45. Bassein Catholic Co-operative Bank Ltd., Bassein (Thana).
46. The Konkan Prant Sahakari Bank Ltd., Bombay-4.
47. Mahatma Fule Co-operative Credit Society Ltd., Bombay-27.
48. Sakhar Kamgar Sahakari Bank Ltd., Shri Shivajinagar (Ahmednagar).
49. Sangli Zila Kamgar Co-operative Bank Ltd., Bombay-4.
50. Sholapur District Revenue Department Staff Co-operative Society Ltd., Sholapur.
51. The Konkanastha Tillori Kunbi Co-operative Credit Society Ltd., Parel, Bombay-12.
52. Malkapur Urban Co-operative Bank Ltd., Malkapur (Buldana).
53. Rajajinagar Co-operative Bank Ltd., Bangalore-10.

54. Bangalore District Industrial Co-operative Bank Ltd., Bangalore.
55. Dharwar Division Postal Co-operative Credit Society Ltd., Dharwar.
56. Urban Co-operative Bank Ltd., Ajmer.
57. Umaid Co-operative Credit Society Ltd., Jodhpur.

[No. F. 18/4/68-SB.1]

V. SWAMINATHAN, Under Secy.

**(Department of Revenue and Insurance)**

*New Delhi, the 29th February 1968*

**S.O. 1084.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by the provision to article 300 of the Constitution, the President hereby makes the following rules to amend the Directorates of Revenue Intelligence and Inspection Administrative Officers Recruitment Rules, 1963, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called Directorates of Revenue Intelligence and Inspection, Customs and Central Excise, Administrative Officers Recruitment (Amendment) Rules, 1968.

(2) They shall be deemed to have come into force on 29th day of March, 1968.

2. In the Schedule to the Directorate of Revenue Intelligence and Inspection Administrative Officers Recruitment Rules, 1963, for the entries in column 4, following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

“(a) Rs. 350—25—500—30—800, for Administrative Officer in Directorate of Revenue Intelligence;

(b) Rs. 350—25—500—30—590—EB—30—830—35—900, for Administrative Officer in the Directorate of Inspection, Customs and Central Excise.”

[No. 12/F. No. 25/3/65-Ad. II.]

T. RAMASWAMY, Under Secy.

**(Department of Revenue and Insurance)**

**INSURANCE**

*New Delhi, the 12th March 1968*

**S.O. 1085.**—Whereas Shri Debabrata Das Gupta, a member of the Executive Committee of the General Insurance Council (*vide* notification of the Office of the Controller of Insurance, Simla No. 105-IF(9)/67 dated the 26th September, 1967) has resigned from the membership of the committee;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (2) of section 64-G of the Insurance Act, 1938 (4 of 1938), the Central Government hereby nominates Shri M. R. Das Gupta, Managing Director, Calcutta Insurance Ltd., 24, Chittaranjan Avenue, Calcutta 12, to be a member of the Committee *vice* Shri Debabrata Das Gupta

[No. F. 51(21)-INS.1/67.]

RAJ K. NIGAM, Dy. Secy.

# MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS

*New Delhi, the 11th March 1968*

**S.O. 1086.**—Whereas by a notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 2803, dated the 7th August, 1967 under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) read with erratum notification published vide S.O. No. 522, dated 27th January 1968, the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the Right of User in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipelines.

And whereas the competent authority has, under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And whereas, the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification;

Now, whereas, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification is hereby acquired for laying the pipelines and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Oil & Natural Gas Commission free from all encumbrances.

## SCHEDULE

State:—Gujarat

Dist.:—Mehsana

Taluka:—Kalol

Village	S. Nos.	Hectare	Arc	P.Are
Vadavawami . . . . .	287	0	6	67
„ . . . . .	285	0	5	16
„ . . . . .	284	0	5	36
„ . . . . .	282	0	5	76
„ . . . . .	275	0	5	6
„ . . . . .	277	0	5	56
„ . . . . .	276	0	3	14
„ . . . . .	275	0	1	1
„ . . . . .	274	0	4	75
„ . . . . .	273	0	10	92
„ . . . . .	267	0	20	73



## CORRIGENDA

New Delhi, the 8th March 1968

S.O. 1037—In the schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 3726 dated the 9th October, 1964 published in the Gazette of India Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii) dated the 24th October, 1964 read with S. O. No. 4191 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated the 12th December, 1964, the following may be deleted.

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent B-B-B
Rampur	252	0-6-0
	253	0-2-4
Umargahna	326	
	446	
	447	
Shadipur	437	0-2-11
	623	0-1-7
Hardaurpur	253	0-17-0
	208	0-9-4

[No. F. 31(50)63-ONG/IOC/Vol. 9(a)]

S.O. 1088—In the schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 1191 dated the 21st March, 1964 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii) dated the 4th April, 1964, the following may be deleted;

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent B-B-B
Jmrauri Kalyanpur	1339	0-4-16
Jariyapur	566	0-0-2
	567	0-0-16
	783	0-1-4
	787	0-1-10
	907	0-0-10
	908	0-3-0
	909	0-2-5
	913	0-1-10
	914	0-0-15
	935	0-1-18
	940	0-1-15
	942	0-1-7
	943	0-0-7
	944	0-2-10
	955	0-1-0
	968	0-0-10
	970	0-1-10
Jasawan Khara	395/930	0-2-11
	397/933	0-1-10
	398/952	0-3-0
	399/956	0-1-2
	409/974	0-1-10

	Survey Plot No.	Extent B-B-B
Khadra	62	0-1-4
	66	0-2-3
	67	0-5-14
	68	0-1-6
	78	0-1-19
	79	0-6-9
	80	0-1-6
	215	0-1-10
	216	0-1-0
Pahur	113	0-6-15
	114	0-0-9
	115	0-6-0
Basawanpur	175	0-1-15
	213	0-4-10
	215	0-0-10
	232	0-2-5
Yadgarpur	254	0-0-10
	269	0-1-0
	270	0-6-10
Habibpur	3	0-4-0
	6	0-1-16
	7	0-0-2
	8	0-0-5
	34	0-2-0
	35	0-2-10
	38/2	0-8-11
Hardaurpur	58/1	0-3-0
	199	0-6-8
	204	0-1-13
	205	0-13-2
	209	0-13-10
	230	0-10-16
	232	0-1-5-15
	240	0-17-0
Umargahna	252	0-19-17
	324	0-6-10
	328	0-6-15
	440	0-3-0
	445	0-3-5
	449	0-0-5
	464	0-0-15
Sadipur	470	0-0-9
	437	0-0-5
	438	0-7-18
	439	0-2-0
	440	0-2-0
	442	0-3-10
	447	0-0-16
	452	0-1-18
	455	0-2-15
	490	0-0-6
Mauhar	496	0-1-4
	2051/2	0-1-3
	2052	0-1-16
	2053	0-5-0
	2079	0-3-10
	2081/3	0-6-3
	2095	0-3-14

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent B-B-B
Mauhar— <i>contd.</i>	2097/1 . . . . .	0-1-5
	2097/2 . . . . .	0-0-13
	2098/1 . . . . .	0-1-6
	2098/2 . . . . .	0-0-15
	2123 . . . . .	0-1-16
	2124 . . . . .	0-0-14
	2140 . . . . .	0-3-15
	2141 . . . . .	0-0-13
	2143 . . . . .	0-0-14
	2148 . . . . .	0-1-15
	2150 . . . . .	0-4-14
	2183 . . . . .	0-1-16
	2195 . . . . .	0-2-10
	2196/2 . . . . .	0-0-12
	2201 . . . . .	0-1-4
	2202 . . . . .	0-1-12
	2203 . . . . .	0-1-7
	2204 . . . . .	0-1-12
	3828 . . . . .	0-0-6
	3829/2 . . . . .	0-0-12
	3844 . . . . .	0-1-4
	3865 . . . . .	0-1-5
	3866 . . . . .	0-1-0
	3988 . . . . .	0-1-7
	3991 . . . . .	0-1-0
	3997 . . . . .	0-0-5
	3999/1 . . . . .	0-2-15
	4100/1 . . . . .	0-1-0
	4100/2 . . . . .	0-1-10
	4100/3 . . . . .	0-1-0
	4105 . . . . .	0-0-5
	4106 . . . . .	0-1-5
	4108 . . . . .	0-1-13
	4109 . . . . .	0-1-0
	4113 . . . . .	0-0-10
Harsinghpur . . . . .	140 . . . . .	0-14-4
	143 . . . . .	0-11-2
	144 . . . . .	0-3-14
	154 . . . . .	0-0-10
	155 . . . . .	0-1-5
Pahbehta . . . . .	94 . . . . .	0-5-8
	105 . . . . .	0-1-16
	109 . . . . .	0-5-5
Aung . . . . .	123 . . . . .	1-6-0
	126 . . . . .	0-0-5
Rampur . . . . .	202 . . . . .	0-12-19
	228 . . . . .	1-18-19
	238 . . . . .	0-1-3
	242 . . . . .	1-12-10
	246 . . . . .	0-4-10
	250 . . . . .	0-10-6
	257 . . . . .	0-2-4
	284 . . . . .	0-8-6
	285 . . . . .	0-2-11
	287 . . . . .	0-3-2
	290 . . . . .	0-11-14
	291 . . . . .	0-1-13
Hasnapur . . . . .	260 . . . . .	0-4-0
	261 . . . . .	0-15-6
	262 . . . . .	0-2-5
	263 . . . . .	0-5-17

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent B-B-B
<i>Hasnapur—contd.</i>		
	264	0-4-19
	265	0-5-12
	266	0-0-12
	267	0-4-16
	268	0-0-4
	272	0-5-5
	273	0-8-8
	279	0-6-0
	280/2	0-4-4
	289	0-7-16
	299	0-4-11
	300	0-5-2
	301	0-0-6
	302	0-4-10
	303	0-4-19
	304	0-0-1
	344	0-3-10
	624	0-0-5
	625/1	0-8-2
	626	0-4-19
	627	0-1-7
	629	0-4-8
	630	0-1-16
	631	0-3-3
	640	0-11-8
	643	0-5-8
	644	0-3-0
	654/1	0-0-4
	655	0-6-15
	656	0-2-8
	657	0-0-8
	662	0-1-0
	663	0-3-0
	664	0-16-8
	692	0-5-18
	693	0-2-13
	703	0-8-8
	706	0-6-11
	707	0-3-15
	720	0-3-0
	722	0-10-7
	941/545	0-8-14
Okhara	257	0-9-0
	262	0-1-0
	263	0-4-0
	272	0-1-5
	543	0-13-0
	552	1-11-0
Godhrauli	1149	0-0-4
	1150	0-0-10
	1163	0-0-10
	1164	0-1-0
	1165	0-0-5
	1171	0-2-0
	1210	0-2-0
	1214	0-4-9
	1251	0-1-10
	1252	0-1-13
	1255	0-1-16
	1260	0-0-10
	1426	0-1-0
	1427	0-3-3
	1437	0-5-7

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent B-B-B
<i>Godhrauli—contd.</i>		
	1438 . . . . .	0-9-1
	1440 . . . . .	0-2-9
	1441 . . . . .	0-8-13
	1447 . . . . .	0-12-19
	1449 . . . . .	0-4-14
	1450 . . . . .	0-0-7
	1451M . . . . .	0-2-1
	1453 . . . . .	0-1-8
	1496 . . . . .	0-4-4
	1497 . . . . .	0-3-4
	1498 . . . . .	0-0-18
	1499 . . . . .	0-9-3
	1502 . . . . .	0-8-17
	1503 . . . . .	0-3-10
	1505 . . . . .	0-13-10
	1507 . . . . .	0-7-13
	1509 . . . . .	0-1-15
	1511 . . . . .	0-13-10
	1515 . . . . .	0-5-10
<i>Mamrejpur</i>		
	478 . . . . .	0-16-16
	479 . . . . .	0-12-3
	480/1 . . . . .	0-1-2
	532 . . . . .	0-1-8
	533 . . . . .	0-5-0
	534 . . . . .	0-11-14
	536/3 . . . . .	0-8-14
	536/6 . . . . .	0-2-0
	537 . . . . .	0-1-4
	538/1 . . . . .	0-2-0
	541 . . . . .	0-12-12
	543/1 . . . . .	0-1-2
	543/2 . . . . .	0-1-3
	544 . . . . .	0-10-0
	546 . . . . .	0-1-16
	547 . . . . .	0-4-0
	548 . . . . .	0-4-1
	549 . . . . .	0-2-17
	550 . . . . .	0-0-4
	560 . . . . .	0-1-0
	561 . . . . .	0-5-5
	562 . . . . .	0-0-12
	563 . . . . .	0-8-11
	564 . . . . .	0-4-1
	565 . . . . .	0-3-16
	566 . . . . .	0-0-6
	567/2 . . . . .	0-0-9
	568 . . . . .	0-7-9
	569 . . . . .	0-0-18
	574 . . . . .	0-2-5
	571/1 . . . . .	0-0-10
	575/3 . . . . .	0-0-10
	576 . . . . .	0-16-13
<i>Kanspur Gugauli</i>		
	2078 . . . . .	0-3-0
	2102 . . . . .	0-0-5
	2110 . . . . .	0-2-5
	2111 . . . . .	0-4-10
	2203 . . . . .	0-4-17
	2204 . . . . .	0-4-6
	2208 . . . . .	0-4-14
	2209 . . . . .	0-1-0
	2253 . . . . .	0-3-3
	2254 . . . . .	0-7-3
	2288 . . . . .	0-1-10

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent B-B-B
<b>Kanspur Gugauli—contd.</b>		
	2290 . . . . .	0-0-5
	2291 . . . . .	0-1-0
	2296 . . . . .	0-3-15
	2428 . . . . .	0-1-10
	2429/1 . . . . .	0-1-10
	2434 . . . . .	0-4-15
	2435 . . . . .	0-1-17
	2436 . . . . .	0-0-10
	2505 . . . . .	0-0-5
	2510 . . . . .	0-1-15
	2511 . . . . .	0-0-5
	2513 . . . . .	0-1-4
	2514 . . . . .	0-4-0
	2555 . . . . .	0-1-0
	2557 . . . . .	0-0-10
	2558 . . . . .	0-2-0
	2559 . . . . .	0-1-1
	2561 . . . . .	0-2-16
	2563/1 . . . . .	0-1-2
	2564 . . . . .	0-1-10

[No. F. 31 (50) 63-ONG/IOC/Vol. 9(b)]

**S.O. 1089.**—In the schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 1193 dated the 21st March, 1964 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated the 4th April 1964 the following may be deleted;

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent B-B-B
<b>Rampur Khurana</b> . . . . .	747 . . . . .	0-0-10
	799 . . . . .	0-1-15
	801 . . . . .	0-2-5
	802 . . . . .	0-4-0
	804 . . . . .	0-2-10
	883 . . . . .	0-1-15
	884 . . . . .	0-1-0
	910 . . . . .	0-1-0
	976 . . . . .	0-1-10
	977 . . . . .	0-1-0
	978 . . . . .	0-4-0
	985 . . . . .	0-5-10
	988 . . . . .	0-7-0
	989 . . . . .	0-3-0
	991 . . . . .	0-6-10
<b>Sangawan</b> . . . . .	794 . . . . .	0-1-0
	984 . . . . .	0-7-0
	1006 . . . . .	0-7-0
<b>Bhojapur</b> . . . . .	513 . . . . .	0-1-10
	542 . . . . .	0-1-0
	547 . . . . .	0-1-0
	557 . . . . .	0-3-0
	559 . . . . .	0-3-0
	562 . . . . .	0-5-0
	563 . . . . .	0-0-15
	564 . . . . .	0-1-0

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent B-B-B
<b>Bhogapur—contd.</b>		
	568 . . .	0-3-15
	572 . . .	0-1-0
	574 . . .	0-3-10
	578 . . .	0-3-0
	582 . . .	0-4-0
	587 . . .	0-6-0
	600 . . .	0-1-0
	610 . . .	0-2-10
<b>Haswa</b> . . . . .	1608 . . .	0-1-10
	1810 . . .	0-1-0
<b>Bkari</b> . . . . .	1245 . . .	0-1-0
	1246 . . .	0-7-15
	1249 . . .	0-8-0
	1254 . . .	0-3-0
	1257 . . .	0-1-0
	1261 . . .	0-8-0
	1273 . . .	0-0-10
	1278 . . .	0-15-0
	1285 . . .	0-1-0
	1287 . . .	0-1-0
	1288 . . .	0-4-0
	1289 . . .	0-5-10
	1303 . . .	0-4-10
	1304 . . .	0-0-10
	1307 . . .	0-0-10
	1308 . . .	0-1-10
	1346 . . .	0-0-10
	1347 . . .	0-1-0
	1423 . . .	0-5-0
	1424 . . .	0-12-0
	1455 . . .	0-6-0
	1456 . . .	0-7-15
	1462 . . .	0-7-5
	1557 . . .	0-1-0
	1620/1421 . . .	0-1-0
<b>Teksari Khurd</b> . . . . .	19 . . .	0-2-10
<b>Chakhendi</b> . . . . .	458 . . .	0-10-10
	461 . . .	0-7-0
	463 . . .	0-17-5
	465 . . .	0-2-0
<b>Emadpur</b> . . . . .	374 . . .	0-0-5
<b>Alawalpur</b> . . . . .	184 . . .	0-1-5
	187 . . .	0-2-15
	188 . . .	0-14-10
	194 . . .	0-3-0
	195 . . .	0-8-0
	196 . . .	0-4-0
	232 . . .	0-6-0
	233 . . .	0-2-0
	237 . . .	0-1-0
	280 . . .	0-1-10
	282 . . .	0-6-0
	283 . . .	0-0-10
	295 . . .	0-3-0
	296 . . .	0-3-10
	297 . . .	0-1-15
	298 . . .	0-0-10

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent B-B-B
Chak Teksari . . . . .	11 . . . . .	0-2-10
	13 . . . . .	0-4-5
	14 . . . . .	0-1-0
Chak Sada . . . . .	78 . . . . .	0-4-10
	81 . . . . .	0-2-0
	83 . . . . .	0-2-15
	98 . . . . .	0-9-15
Korain . . . . .	1260 . . . . .	0-4-0
	1262 . . . . .	0-0-10
	1263 . . . . .	0-1-0
	1264 . . . . .	0-6-0
	1312 . . . . .	0-3-5
	1316 . . . . .	0-10-0
	1318 . . . . .	0-0-5
	1319 . . . . .	0-1-0
	1322 . . . . .	0-3-15
	1323 . . . . .	0-8-10
	1324 . . . . .	0-5-0
	1326 . . . . .	0-2-10
Azmabad Bhainsahi . . . . .	375 . . . . .	0-13-5
	456 . . . . .	0-4-0
	457 . . . . .	0-9-5
	496 . . . . .	0-12-10
	503 . . . . .	0-7-0
	511 . . . . .	0-1-0
	516 . . . . .	0-12-0
	517 . . . . .	0-1-15
	518 . . . . .	0-1-10
Kandhi . . . . .	46 . . . . .	0-0-10
	492 . . . . .	0-0-10
Musaidpur . . . . .	179 . . . . .	0-1-5
	320 . . . . .	0-1-0
	321 . . . . .	0-0-10
	322 . . . . .	0-2-0
	329 . . . . .	0-1-0
	331 . . . . .	0-1-10
	337 . . . . .	0-0-10
	399 . . . . .	0-1-0
	401 . . . . .	0-6-10
	406 . . . . .	0-0-10
	407 . . . . .	0-1-0
	408 . . . . .	0-1-10
	413 . . . . .	0-1-10
	415 . . . . .	0-0-10
	478/395 . . . . .	0-4-0
Atarha . . . . .	164 . . . . .	0-0-10
	175 . . . . .	0-16-0
	176 . . . . .	0-6-0
	177 . . . . .	0-11-5
	192 . . . . .	0-5-0
	194 . . . . .	0-6-10
	195 . . . . .	0-14-0
	196 . . . . .	0-11-15
	198 . . . . .	0-4-0
	202 . . . . .	1-7-0
	203 . . . . .	0-8-0
	205 . . . . .	0-0-15



Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent
		B-B-B
Atarha— <i>contd.</i>	206	0-5-0
	217	0-1-0
	253	0-0-10
	256	0-14-0
	260	0-4-0
	261	0-0-5
Teksari Buzurg	929	0-1-10
	977	0-1-0
	995	0-2-0
	1035	0-1-0
	1076	0-2-0
	1077	0-5-15
	1079	0-1-10
	1086	0-0-10
Bira Buddhanpur	126	0-1-0
	127	0-4-10
Sulemanpur	3346	0-17-0
	3349	0-8-10
	3351	0-2-0
	3368	0-2-10
	3370	0-1-0
	3371	0-5-0
	3413	0-4-0
	3430	0-2-0
Ramuwa Panthuwa	69	0-4-0
	70	0-5-0
	85	0-10-0
	90	0-6-0
	93	0-0-15
	312	0-1-5
	313	1-0-10
	314	0-10-10
	322	0-6-10
	323	0-13-10
	326	0-6-10
	331	0-0-15
	333	0-1-10
	334	0-1-10
	342	0-8-0
	343	0-17-5
Madhopur	41	0-9-0
	43	0-0-15
	45	0-5-15
Bahrampur	628	0-2-0
	629	0-3-10
	630	0-3-0
Jamalpur	76	0-8-0
	77	0-9-0
	88	0-14-0
	89	0-1-0
	102	0-12-15
	103	0-1-10
	105	0-2-0
	106	0-3-10
	110	0-2-0
	133	0-4-0
	143	0-2-10
	144	0-0-10

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent
		B.B.B.
Jamalpur— <i>contd.</i>	236	0-2-0
	237	0-4-0
	239	0-2-5
	240	0-19-0
Bhikharipur	29	0-0-10
	30	0-0-10
	31	0-2-0
	32	0-9-10
	46	0-13-0
	48	0-0-10
	49	0-1-0
	64	0-3-0
	65	0-3-0
	66	0-2-0

[No. F. 31(50)63-ONG/IOC/Vol. 7(a).]

**S. O. 1090**—In the schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 2716 dated the 25th July, 1964 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated the 8th August, 1964, the following may be deleted.

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent
		B.B.B.
Jhaupur	6	0-5-0
	7	0-11-0
	177	0-4-5
Khambhapur	210	0-4-0
	212	0-11-0
	213	0-2-15
	215	0-0-10
	216	0-3-0
	223	0-7-0
	237	0-15-0

[No. F. 31(50)63-ONG/IOC/Vol. 7(b).]

**S.O. 1091**—In the schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 3020 dated the 24th August, 1964 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated the 5th September, 1964, the following may be deleted :

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent
		B.B.B.
Jamalpur	88	0-2-0
	103	0-1-0
	241	0-14-0

[No. F. 31(50)63-ONG/IOC/Vol. 7(c).]

**S.O. 1092**—In the schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 2032 dated the 11th June, 1965 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, sub-section (ii) dated the 26th June, 1965, the following may be deleted :

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent
		B.B.B.
Bahrapur	624	0-7-0
	625	0-6-0

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent
Madhopur	3	B-B-B 0-1-0
Ramuwa Panthuwa	326	0-1-15
Sulemanpur	3351	0-10-0
	3370	0-6-0
Bira Buddhanpur	72	0-5-15
Teksari Buzurg	975	0-4-10
Ataraha	259	0-4-0
Jamalpur	235	0-1-10
Khambhapur	225	0-2-5

[No. F. 31(50)63-ONG/IOC/Vol. 7/(d).]

**S.O. 1093**—In the schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 3475 dated the 24th September, 1964 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated the 3rd October, 1964, the following may be deleted :

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent
Khambhapur	224	B-B-B 0-2-0
	237	0-1-0

[No. F. 31(50)63-ONG/IOC/Vol. 7/(e).]

**S.O. 1094**—In the schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 3053 dated the 3rd October, 1966 published in the Gazette of India Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated the 15th October, 1966, the following may be deleted :

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent.
Bhikharipur	15	B-B-B. 0-1-0

[No. F. 31(50)63-ONG/IOC/1027/Vol. 7/(f).]

New Delhi, the 11th March 1968

**S.O. 1095**—In the schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 1806, dated the 18th May, 1964, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii), dated the 30th July, 1964 read with S.O. No. 2729, dated the 29th July, 1964 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii) dated the 8th August, 1964, the following may be deleted;

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent
Uchati	171	B-B-B 0-0-10
	179	0-0-5
	182	0-0-5

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent
		B-B-B
Naugawan	1259	0-0-10
	1266	0-0-5
	1271	0-2-10
	1280	0-2-0
	1288	0-1-0
	1291	0-1-0
	1308/1	0-0-10
	1308/3	0-0-10
	1318	0-2-0
	1360	0-0-10
	1364	0-3-0
	1372	0-1-0
	1377/2	0-1-0
	1434/1	0-3-0
	1446	0-1-15
	1447	0-1-10
	1448/2	0-0-10
	1452	0-0-15
	1455	0-3-0
	1535/2	0-1-10
	1538/2	0-12-0
	1541	0-1-0
	1551	0-2-10
	1669/7	0-3-0
	1702	0-10-0
	1704	0-8-0
	1722	0-0-10
	1731	0-1-0
	1732	0-5-10
	1757	0-7-0
	1758	0-3-0
	1761	0-1-0
	1762	0-7-0
	1669/2	0-1-0
Tilsahri Khurd	760	0-0-2
	777	0-0-14
	51	0-0-2
Phupphuhar Rajthok	581	0-1-5
Karbigawan	97	0-0-10
	98	0-1-0
	99/1	0-4-0
	99/2	0-3-0
	100	0-11-0
	101	0-6-0
	349/1	0-2-10
	360/1	0-8-10
	371/2	0-0-10
	371/8	0-1-0
	372/1	0-4-10
	373/3	0-5-0
	602	0-3-0
	603	0-4-10
	613	0-2-0
	614	0-2-15
	616	0-1-10
	716	0-1-10
	616	0-1-10
	617/1	0-5-0
	621/1	0-2-5
	621/2	0-2-0

Village	Survey Plot No	Extent
Karbigawan— <i>contd.</i>		B-B-B
	706	0-0-10
	710	0-2-10
	711	0-2-0
	2239	0-0-5
	2534	0-0-10
	1967	0-2-0
Sangawan	581	0-0-5
	785	0-3-0
	803	0-4-0
	804	0-0-10
	983	0-0-5
Puranpur	197	0-0-15
	316	0-0-15
	329	0-3-0
	332	0-0-10
	368	0-0-10
	369	0-3-5
	380	0-0-10
	383	0-0-5
	384/1	0-0-10
	392	0-1-10
	590	0-0-10
	592	0-1-10
	594	0-0-10
	690	0-2-10
	700	0-1-0
	730	0-0-5
	733	0-0-10
	754	0-1-10
	769	0-14-10
	794	0-5-0
	797	0-0-10
	798	0-4-10
	946	0-2-10
	953	0-11-0
	958	0-4-0
	962	0-3-0
	969	0-4-0
	970	0-1-10
	971	0-3-0
	975/2	0-0-15
	980	0-1-5
	983	0-5-0
	984	0-0-10
	985/1	0-0-10
Satbari	301	0-7-0
	396	1-12-10
	397	0-10-0
	415	0-8-0
	416/1	0-11-5
	416/2	0-9-10
	419	0-2-10
	460/1	0-8-0
	460/2	0-5-0
	463	0-4-5
	478	0-4-5
Tharepah	1	0-2-10
	15	0-3-0
	18	0-4-0
	114	0-0-5
	117/1	0-1-0

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent
		B.B.B.
Tharepah— <i>contd.</i>	120/2	0-0-10
	137	0-0-15
	139	0-1-10
	173	0-0-10
	179	0-1-10
	197	0-0-10
	198	0-1-0
	203/1	0-0-10
	268	0-1-10
	289	0-1-0
Deepapur	888	0-0-10
	978	0-1-0
Newada Bausar	296	0-2-0
	297	0-0-5
	326	0-0-11
	327	0-1-0
	334	0-0-12
	360	0-0-5
Gauriya	156	0-0-16
	160	0-0-8
Gangapur	297	0-0-15
	433	0-0-5
Bausar	975	0-1-12
	1003	0-0-6
	1008	0-1-2
	1153	0-0-5
	1238	0-0-12

[No. F. 31(50)63-OR/IOC/Vol. II/(a).]

**S.O. 1096.**—In the Schedule to the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum & Chemicals S.O. No. 3027, dated the 24th August, 1964 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), dated the 5th September, 1964, the following may be deleted:

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent
Tharepah	196/2	B-B-B
	290	0-2-0
		0-0-10

[No. F. 31(50)63-OR/IOC/Vol. II/(b).]

**S.O. 1097.**—In the Schedule to the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 3422, dated the 19th September, 1964 published in the Gazette of India Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), dated the 26th September, 1964, the following may be deleted:

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent
Naugawan	1276/3	B-B-B
		0-4-0
Puranpur	768	0-6-0

[No. F. 31(50)63-OR/IOC/Vol. II/(c).]

**S.O. 1098.**—In the Schedule to the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 3727, dated the 13th October, 1964 published in the Gazette of India Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii), dated the 24th October, 1964, the following may be deleted:

Village	Survey Plot No	Extent
Barra	463	B-B-B
	637	0-0-5
	885	0-1-0
	893	0-0-15
	1214	0-1-10
	1289	0-0-10
Gujarini	474	0-0-5
	475	0-0-5
	478	0-0-10
	1143	0-0-15

[No. F. 31(50)63-OR/IOC/Vol II/(d).]

**S.O. 1099.**—In the Schedule to the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 823, dated the 5th March, 1965, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), dated the 13th March 1965, the following may be deleted:

Village	Survey Plot No	Extent
Karbigwan	350	B-B-B 0-1-0

[No. F. 31(50)63-OR/IOC/Vol. II/(e).]

*New Delhi, the 12th March 1968*

**S.O. 1100.**—In the Schedule to the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 1085, dated the 18th March, 1964 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii), dated the 28th March, 1964, the following may be deleted:

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent
Karhauli	734/2	B-B-B
	838	0-4-0
	846	0-0-10
	1014/1	0-1-0
	1014/2	0-2-5
		0-0-10
Lehdi	541/1	0-0-10
	541/3	0-0-10
Chakdiha	4	0-0-10
	45/1	0-0-10
	46	0-0-15
	93/1	0-1-5

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent
Nahwar	63	B-B-B
	69/1	0-1-0
	93	0-0-10
	94/1	0-0-5
	94/2	0-0-5
	94/3	0-0-5
	97	0-0-5
	144	0-0-10
	145	0-0-8
Baksandi	24/2	0-1-0
	25	0-5-5
	28/2	0-1-0
	31/1	0-3-0
	57/2	0-2-5
	58/4	0-2-10
	72/1	0-0-5
	273/2	0-5-0
	278/2	0-3-0
	284	0-3-10
	285	0-3-10
	306	0-8-0
	307	0-4-0
	312	0-1-15
	322	0-12-10
Bela Ahiran	29	0-11-12
	46	0-1-0
	47	0-5-10
	48	0-0-10
	51	0-2-0
	55	0-4-10
	130	0-2-12
	131	0-4-9
Sarwanpur	50	0-1-0
Hempur	41/4	0-3-0
	42/2	0-0-10
	43/3	0-0-15
	44/3	0-1-10
	44/5	0-2-10
	44/11	0-1-0
	44/12	0-1-0
	77	0-1-0
Tikari	143/1	0-1-10
Umapur Kalan	468	0-2-0
	483	0-1-0
	485	0-4-10
	486	0-0-10
	499	0-1-10
	500	0-1-0
Garetha	165	0-2-5
	166	0-2-10
	167	0-4-10
	226	0-3-0
	228	0-0-5
	229	0-0-10
	230	0-3-5
	231	0-1-14
	258/1	0-1-0
	264	0-3-0
	266/1	0-1-10
	267/2	0-3-10



Village	Survey Plot No	Extent
		B-B B
Chaukatha Lachhan	170	0-0-15
	171	0-1-0
	189/1	0-0-10
	189/2	0-1-0
	207/2	0-1-10
	210	0-4-15
	226/1	0-0-5
	226/2	0-0-15
	243/2	0-2-0
	244/1	0-1-5
	244/2	0-1-0
	245	0-1-0
	277	0-0-10
	278	0-2-0
	286	0-2-15
	287	0-0-15
	295/2	0-1-15
	296	0-0-10
	298/1	0-1-5
	298/2	0-2-10
	308	0-1-0
	309	0-4-0
Bisahjan Khurd	297/2	0-2-0
	355/1	0-0-15
Bisahjan Kalan	139/1	0-0-10
	144	0-1-15
	146/1	0-0-10
	146/6	0-0-3
	146/7	0-0-13
	146/8	0-1-2
	153/3	0-3-0
Kukuri	304/1	0-0-5
	387/5	0-0-5
	388/2	0-0-10
	390/2	0-0-10
	472/1	0-0-15
	475/1	0-0-5
	480/1	0-0-5
	482/1	0-2-5
	518	0-1-0
	546	0-3-0
Kotaha	545	0-2-0
	44/1	0-0-8
	44/2	0-0-8
	44/3	0-0-3
	44/4	0-0-3
	44/5	0-0-3
	47	0-0-15

[No F 31(50)63-OR/IOC/Vol 8/(a) ]

**S O 1101**—In the schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S O No 1602, dated the 29th April, 1964 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii) dated the 9th May, 1964 the following may be deleted,

Village	Survey Plot No	Extent
		B-B-B
L ruwa	51	0-0-5
	135/1	0-2-0
	135/2	0-1-0
	135/3	0-0-5

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent
Uruwa— <i>contd.</i>	135/4	B.B.B. 0-1-10
	138	0-7-10
	141/1	0-0-5
	145	0-3-10
	148	0-2-0
	172	0-2-0
	478	0-1-0
	479	0-1-0
	508	0-0-5

[No. F. 31(50)63-OR/IOC/Vol. 8/(b).]

**S.O. 1102**—In the schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 1784, dated the 14th May, 1964 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii), dated the 23rd May, 1964, the following may be deleted;

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent
Manpur	105	B-B-B 0-2-0
Tikri	598	0-2-0
Nahwai	147/1	0-0-10

[No. F. 31(50)63-OR/IOC/Vol. 8/(c).]

**S.O. 1103**—In the schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 1808, dated the 18th May, 1964 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii), dated the 30th May, 1964, the following may be deleted;

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent
Uruwa	482	B-B-B 0-4-0

[No. F. 31(50)63-OR/IOC/Vol. 8/(d).]

**S.O. 1104**—In the schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 2028, dated the 8th June, 1965 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii), dated the 26th June, 1965, the following may be deleted,

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent
Nahwai	78/2	B-B-B 0-0-10
Uruwa	137	0-2-0
Bisahijan Kalan	133/2	0-1-15
Sarwanpur	52	0-0-5
Kathauli	839	0-8-0

[No. F. 31(50)63-OR/IOC/Vol. 8/(e).]

New Delhi, the 14th March 1968

**S.O. 1105.**—In the schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum & Chemicals S.O. No. 2332 dated the 14th July, 1965 published in the Gazette of India Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii) dated the 24th July, 1965, the following may be deleted:—

Village	Survey Plot No	Extent
Baruin	473	B-B-B 0-2-0

[No F 31(50)63-ONG/IOC/Vol 3/(a) ]

**S.O. 1106** —In the schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 1986 dated the 27th May, 1964 published in the Gazette of India Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii) dated the 6th June, 1964, the following may be deleted:—

Village	Survey Plot No	Extent
Mahmoodpur	1467	B-B-B 0-1-0

[No F 31(50)63-ONG/IOC/Vol 3(b) ]

**S.O. 1107.**—In the schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 1779 dated the 11th May, 1964, published in the Gazette of India Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii) dated the 23rd May, 1964, the following may be deleted:—

Village	Survey Plot No	Extent
Sikandarpur	681	B-B-B 0-1-0

[No F 31(50)63-ONG/IOC/Vol 3(c) ]

**S.O 1108** —In the schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 1083 dated the 18th March 1964 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3 Sub-Section (ii) dated the 28th March, 1964 the following may be deleted:—

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent
Usia	3189 3195 3211 3224 3225	B-B-B 0-1-5 0-1-0 0-0-10 0-0-10 0-0-10

[No F 31(50)63-ONG/IOC/Vol 3/(d) ]

S.O. 1109.—In the schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 1084 dated the 18th March, 1964 published in the Gazette of India Part II, Section 3. Sub-section (ii) dated the 28th March, 1964, the following may be deleted.---

Village	Survey Plot No.	Extent
		B-B-B
Harnathpur	734	0-0-10
	739	0-1-0
	745	0-0-10
	1330	0-0-10
	1339	0-1-0
	1345	0-1-0
	1350	0-0-10
	1374	0-0-5
	2195	0-0-10
	2197	0-0-10
	2198	0-1-0
	2201	0-2-10
	2222	0-0-5
Marautia Makrand <i>alias</i> Kajarah	202	0-1-0
	208	0-1-0
	209	0-1-0
Patkhau	2549	0-2-10
	2554/1	0-0-10
	2556/2	0-1-0
Beruin	94	0-0-10
	108	0-0-5
	132	0-2-0
	202	0-0-10
	276	0-1-15
	164	0-1-0
	480	0-0-10
	487	0-2-0
	535	0-2-0
Dildarnagar	3693/2	0-1-0
Harikaranpur	64	0-0-10
	66	0-0-10
	71	0-0-10
	73	0-1-0
	75	0-0-10
	143	0-1-0
	144	0-0-10
	147	0-0-15
	149	0-2-10
	113	0-0-5
	114	0-0-10
	415	0-0-5
Manihar Khurd	223	0-1-0
	224	0-1-10
	236	0-1-10
	238	0-0-5
	247	0-0-5
	248	0-0-5
	251/1	0-0-10
	252	0-0-10
	257	0-0-10

Village	Survey Plot No.	Exten
		B-B-B
Jagwal . . . . .	357/2 . . . . .	0-0-10
	368 . . . . .	0-3-10
	371/3 . . . . .	0-1-10
	372 . . . . .	0-3-0
Khemapur . . . . .	140 . . . . .	0-1-0
	143 . . . . .	0-1-0
	144/1 . . . . .	0-0-15
Iliachipur . . . . .	313/6 . . . . .	0-7-5
	320 . . . . .	0-6-0
	321/1 & 2 . . . . .	0-3-10
	496 . . . . .	0-8-10
	497 . . . . .	0-3-5
	498 . . . . .	0-3-10
	499 . . . . .	0-0-15
	500 . . . . .	0-4-0
	503 . . . . .	0-2-0
	516 . . . . .	0-0-10
	519 . . . . .	0-0-5
	517 . . . . .	0-1-10
	562 . . . . .	0-1-10
	563 . . . . .	0-6-0
	591 . . . . .	0-7-5
Darauli . . . . .	1649 . . . . .	0-1-0
	1653 . . . . .	0-0-10
	1654 . . . . .	0-1-0
Mania . . . . .	37 . . . . .	0-0-10
	93 . . . . .	0-0-19
	94 . . . . .	0-0-1
	369/2 . . . . .	0-3-0
Sikandarpur . . . . .	682 . . . . .	0-1-0
	686M . . . . .	0-0-10
	688 . . . . .	0-1-0
	700 . . . . .	0-1-0
	720/2 . . . . .	0-1-0
	723 . . . . .	0-1-
	723/1 . . . . .	0-1-0
	723/2 . . . . .	0-1-0
	724 . . . . .	0-1-15
	725 . . . . .	0-1-0
	730 . . . . .	0-0-10
	731 . . . . .	0-1-1
	760 . . . . .	0-1-1
	774 . . . . .	0-0-5
	776 . . . . .	0-1-0
	779 . . . . .	0-1-0
	787/1 . . . . .	0-1-0
	976 . . . . .	0-0-5
	981 . . . . .	0-0-5
	988 . . . . .	0-0-10
	1011 . . . . .	0-0-5
	1024 . . . . .	0-0-10
	1118 . . . . .	0-1-
	1120 . . . . .	0-1-1
	1122 . . . . .	0-0-10
	123/1 . . . . .	0-0-10
	147 . . . . .	0-2-0
	1150 . . . . .	0-1-0
	1170 . . . . .	0-1-10
	1171 . . . . .	0-1-10
	1174 . . . . .	0-0-10
	1176 . . . . .	0-1-0
	119 . . . . .	0-1-18

[No. F. 31(50)63-ONG/IOC/Vol.3/(e).]  
P. P. GUPTA, Under Secy.

